THE PAPERS *of the*
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY
OF AMERICA

VOLUME FORTY NUMBER ONE, 1946

THE MANUSCRIPT OF HARDY'S *Two on a Tower**

By CARL J. WEBER

IF William Wordsworth had written this article, he might have called it "Lines Written in an Attempt to Identify, Separate, and Appraise the Contributions of the three or more Hands that have left their Traces scattered through the Pages of a New England Manuscript of Thomas Hardy." But titles of such descriptive explicitness are not now in style, and I therefore use a more concise, if less specific, label.

Two on a Tower appeared in eight issues of the *Atlantic Monthly* from May through December, 1882. During the quarter of a century that followed, no one showed any interest in or concern with Hardy's manuscripts; but in 1932, when *Two on a Tower* was just half a century old, Hardy bibliographers tried to find the manuscript and failed. Again in 1940, when the Grolier Club of New York City was arranging a magnificent Thomas Hardy centennial exhibition, efforts were renewed to find this lost log of an *Atlantic* voyage, or even to find traces of it, but they all proved unavailing. When the *Descriptive Catalogue* of the Grolier exhibition was printed, *Two on a Tower* was listed with the statement:

* This paper was read at the meeting of the Society, 18 January 1946.

(1

Two on a Tower,

by Thomas Hardy.

Chapter I.

On an early winter afternoon, clear but not cold, when the vegetable world was a ~~nonentity~~ weird multitude of skeletons through whose ribs the sun shone freely, a ~~yellow~~ gleaming landau came to a pause on the crest of a hill in Wessex. The spot was where the old Melchester road, which the carriage had hitherto followed, was joined by a drive that led round into a park at no great distance off. The footman alighted & went to the occupant of the carriage, a lady of about eight & twenty. She was looking through the opening afforded by a field-gate at the undulating stretch of country beyond. In pursuance of some remark from her the servant looked in the same direction.

The central feature of the middle distance as they beheld it was an isolated (circular) hill of no great elevation, which (placed itself in strong chromatic) contrasted with a wide acreage of surrounding arable by being covered with fir trees. ~~about eight~~ ~~many miles round~~ The trees were all of one size & age, so that their tops assumed the precise curve of the hill they grew upon. This fir-clad protuberance (from ~~above~~) the general landscape was yet further marked out by having on its summit a (tower in the form of a ~~ruin~~ classical column, which, though) ~~tower~~. Partly immersed in the plantation, it ~~just~~ rose above the tree tops to a considerable height upon

THIS, AND THE FOLLOWING ILLUSTRATIONS, ARE REPRODUCED BY PERMISSION OF THE HOUGHTON LIBRARY, HARVARD UNIVERSITY. THE ORIGINAL PAGES MEASURE 202 X 165 MM. THIS PAGE IS ENTIRELY IN HARDY'S HAND

"The manuscript presumably came to America . . . ; it has disappeared."

At last, in the December 1942 issue of *The New England Quarterly,* in an article *Thomas Hardy and his New England Editors,* the present writer was able to announce that "in Portsmouth . . . [in] the Thomas Bailey Aldrich Memorial House . . . is the long-lost manuscript of *Two on a Tower.*" Even more surprising than the finding of the manuscript was the information that Hardy had actually sent the *Atlantic* two manuscripts. I was able to quote Hardy's own statement, in a letter dated March 8, 1882, that he was sending "a duplicate" manuscript, "to guard against accidental loss."

Since the date of this announcement in *The New England Quarterly,* the Aldrich House has been closed, and the manuscript which for sixty years lay hidden in Portsmouth is now in the Houghton Library at Harvard. There I have given it a careful examination. The purpose of this paper is to present the results of this scrutiny of the long-lost autograph of the novel.

Even the most superficial inspection shows that the manuscript is not a "fair copy"; it is not a clean, neat text. Some few sheets look as if they had been copied from the first rough draft and now present an unscarred appearance; but most of them are what is far more interesting: the first tentative draft, with all the after-thoughts, suppressions or additions, interlineations, transpositions — marks which record the travail of the creative artist at work upon intractable material. In the article published four years ago mention was made of the fact that Aldrich had solicited Hardy's contribution to the *Atlantic Monthly* and had accepted it without having first seen the manuscript or even any part of it. He began printing it upon the arrival of the first installment and wrote to Hardy that he promised himself "great pleasure for months to come." But anyone familiar with Aldrich's precise and tidy habits can imagine what he thought of the extremely untidy manuscript which the famous English author began sending him.

With this she started, & reached Warborne in time for the up-train. How much longer than it really is a long journey can seem to be, was fully learnt by the unhappy Viviette that day. The changeful procession of country-seats past which she was dragged had no points of interest for her now. She reached Southampton about mid-day, & drove straight to the Docks. [On approaching the ~~pier~~ gates she was met by a crowd of people & vehicles coming out — men, women, children, porters, policemen, cabs, & carts. The Occident had just sailed.

The adverse intelligence came upon her with such odds after her morning's tension that she could scarcely crawl back to the cab which had brought her. But this was not a time to succumb. As she had no luggage she dismissed the man, & without any real consciousness of what she was doing, strolled away, & sat down on a pile of merchandise.

After long thinking her case assumed a more hopeful complexion. Much might probably be done towards communicating with him in the time at her command. The obvious step to this end, which she should have thought of sooner, would be to go to his grandmother in Welland Bottom, & there obtain his itinerary in detail — no doubt well-known to Mrs Martin. There was no leisure for her to consider longer, if she would be home again that night; & returning to the railway she waited on a seat without eating or drinking till a train was ready to take her back.

[By the time she again stood in Warborne the sun rested his chin upon the meadows, & enwelged the distant outline of the Rings-Hill column in his ruddy rays. ~~By the time she again stood in Warborne~~, & hiring an empty fly that chanced to be at the

A PAGE OF THE ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPT ALMOST ENTIRELY IN HARDY'S HAND BUT WITH INTERPOLATED WORDS IN MRS. HARDY'S HANDWRITING

In spite of, or rather just because of, this invitingly unpolished state, the bibliographically-minded student of these pages must apply himself to them all the more diligently.

I

The first thing that will strike the eye of an attentive reader is the fact that the manuscript was not all written by one hand. The first three pages are in Hardy's handwriting, but page 4 is in the hand of Mrs. Hardy. The author and his wife wrote in styles of penmanship sufficiently alike not to attract the immediate notice of a careless reader, but a deliberate examination of their differing ways of shaping "d", "r", and "s" will soon enable the reader to separate the writing of the author from that of his wife.* Sometimes both appear upon the same page. The first six lines of page 6, for example, were written by Hardy, but Mrs. Hardy wrote (*i.e.*, copied) all the rest of the page. Similarly, Hardy wrote most of page 31, but the last five lines are in Mrs. Hardy's hand. Sometimes corrections in his hand are found on pages written by her, whereas there are almost no changes in her hand on pages written by him. The existence, however, of even one such case calls for examination. Page 314 of the manuscript is almost entirely in Hardy's hand. After writing the sheet, he went over it and made some insertions. But there are also additional inserted words in Mrs. Hardy's handwriting.[1] Their presence in the manuscript will carry special significance for readers who recall reports that Hardy's wife collaborated with him in the composition of his novels. I can best indicate how these rumors of collaboration got abroad by quoting, if I may, from my critical biography of Hardy

* See also the five illustrated pages, the first headed "Wessex Novels," and the next four numbered, in *Thomas Hardy, Novelist or Poet?*, by A. Edward Newton, 1929, described in the text as "in the autograph of the author himself." They are entirely in the hand of Mrs. Hardy, except a very few words interpolated between the lines by Hardy. Catalogued in the Newton sale, May 15, 1941, No. 218, as "all in Hardy's hand." The statement was corrected orally when the lot was knocked down—at a figure which reflected the difference in value of the two handwritings.
C. A. W.

[1] The inserted words "the names & memories of their owners" above line 4.

(*Hardy of Wessex*, New York, 1940, p. 162). Mrs. Hardy, so I have reported,

> gave many visitors [to Max Gate] the impression that she not only copied but also helped to write her husband's books. T. P. O'Connor heard her declare: "I say to his mother, 'Mother, you wrote Thomas's books.' 'No, Emma,' Mother says, 'it was you wrote Thomas's books.' " . . . She told Dr. Fred B. Fisher (the Hardys' physician) that her husband always submitted his novels to her. "She gave me the impression she revised them pretty freely." A French visitor was given the same impression. M. Henri D. Davray noted her willingness to have it believed that it was her hand that put the finishing touches to her husband's rough drafts. Hardy maintained an attitude of simple dignity at such times, and his French caller thought him timid and resigned to a situation he could not improve. When Mrs. Hardy spoke of collaborating with her husband, he remained silent.

In the light of these remarks, the inserted words in her handwriting, written on her husband's manuscript, would be convincing—that is, if there were no other evidence of a conflicting sort. But there *is* other evidence. Hardy himself has told us that he sent Aldrich a duplicate manuscript "to guard against accidental loss." The fact that there was this duplicate manuscript, about which I shall have more to say shortly, and that Hardy sometimes, as I shall prove, made last-minute changes in the duplicate rather than in the original autograph, enables us to explain these insertions made by Mrs. Hardy. She was merely transcribing onto page 314 of the original manuscript the latest corrections made by her husband on the corresponding page of the duplicate manuscript.

In other words, it is clear that she acted as amanuensis, not as collaborator. She seems to have made fair copies of such sheets as had become illegible or puzzling, under Hardy's frequent reworking of bothersome passages, and her handwriting is therefore found at irregular intervals throughout the manuscript and not in long stretches of consecutive pages. This statement must, however, be qualified by an important exception. In transcribing parts of the duplicate manuscript, she held the pen for several

consecutive series of pages. Our knowledge of this fact is due to an accident, about which I shall speak in a moment.

II

The preparation of two manuscripts instead of one had important results, not only for our ability to unravel confusing details in the history of the published novel, but also for our ability to trace the evolution of its text. The path is, however, labyrinthine and the reader will need to exercise all of Sherlock Holmes's careful attention to details, if he is to follow Hardy's traces and not confuse them with those of his colleagues. Although I have stated above that "the manuscript . . . is now in the Houghton Library at Harvard," the reader may well question whether, in the light of all the talk about two MSS., it might not be more correct to say that "*one* of the two manuscripts of *Two on a Tower* has arrived at Harvard" and that this report is based on an examination of that one. I shall try to answer this question.

It may, I think, be stated with more than a fair amount of assurance that the Houghton manuscript is the *only* surviving manuscript of the novel, and that it is neither wholly the original nor wholly the duplicate but a mixture of the two, a bibliographical sandwich. The marks of the two are not, perhaps, as easily detected as are the differences between the two handwritings; but when attention has been called to them, even an obtuse Dr. Watson will be able to follow their lead.

The very first page of the manuscript carries evidence that there were at one time two manuscripts. After the title Two on a Tower in Hardy's hand, there appears in the handwriting of Thomas Bailey Aldrich: "Please return this Ms. to me when you are done with it. T.B.A."—obviously a note to the typesetter or printer. When the manuscript came back to Aldrich, he seems to have regretted having expressed himself in such informal English ("when you are done"!) and set about covering up the scar.

sounds (what might be caused by meeting & whispering lovers.) within the corridor. ~~He~~ In due time a movement in that quarter actually became audible. Thereupon, returning like a shade to his room, Louis reentered the corridor, & listened intently. All was silent again, and darkness reigned from end to end. Glanville, however, groped his way along the passage till he again reached Swithin's door where he examined by the light of a wax-match he had brought, the condition of the spider's thread. It was gone; somebody had carried it off bodily, as Samson carried off the pin and the web. In other words a person had passed through the door.

Still holding the faint wax-light in his hand Louis turned to the door of Lady Constantine's chamber, where he first observed that though it was pushed together so as to appear fastened on cursory (with his foot) view, the door was not closed by about a quarter of an inch. This being all he wished to see he dropped his light, & extinguishing it listening he heard a voice within — Viviette's voice, in a subdued murmur, though speaking earnestly. Without any hesitation Louis then returned, to Swithin's door, opened it, & walked in. The starlight from without was sufficient, now that his eyes had grown accustomed to the darkness, to reveal that the room was unoccupied, & that nothing therein had been disturbed. The worthy gentleman's plot was now complete. With a heavy tread he came forth, walked loudly across the corridor, knocked at Lady Constantine's door, & called, "Viviette!"

She heard him instantly, replying "yes" in clear tones. Immedi-

A PAGE OF THE *DUPLICATE* MANUSCRIPT, IN MRS. HARDY'S HAND, ALL INTERLINEATIONS EXCEPT 'A MOVEMENT IN' IN LINE ONE IN HARDY'S HAND

From page one of the duplicate manuscript, also in Hardy's hand, Aldrich cut a slip of paper bearing the title and Hardy's name, TWO ON A TOWER, by THOMAS HARDY, and pasted this over the title on page one of the original, thus completely covering up T.B.A.'s note to the printer or the typesetter. His words can, however, easily be read through the superimposed slip of paper.

Further evidence of the one-time existence of two manuscripts is found scattered through the pages still extant,—namely, marks left by the printers who set up the type with which the *Atlantic Monthly* was printed. For example, on page 14 "Strip 3 Hitchins" is written; on page 25, "Daly"; on page 31, "N. Mahegan"; and on page 75, "M. Henderson." These four names recur from time to time, in red, blue, or black pencil, throughout five of the eight installments of the novel; *but* there are no such pencil marks in the installments for September, October, and November. The type for these three issues of the *Atlantic* was set up in July, August, and September, while Aldrich was absent in Europe for the summer. During these months when his editorial chair was empty, the sheets of Hardy's original manuscript, used in setting up type for the *Atlantic*, apparently failed to return to Aldrich's desk and were, presumably, not preserved. Hence, upon Aldrich's return to Boston, in order to complete his salvaging of the manuscript of the novel, he had to sandwich pages 180-312 from the *duplicate* manuscript in between the preceding (1-179) and the succeeding (313-357) pages from the original. The blue-pencil marks and the names begin again on page 313, the first page of the final installment, which Daly, M. Henderson, and N. Mahegan set up. Hitchens seems to have worked only on the first month's installment.

These sheets from the duplicate manuscript, sheets which the printer never had occasion to handle, are more frequently and more consecutively in Mrs. Hardy's hand than are the other extant pages. She obviously did more copying of the duplicate manuscript than of the original, and her hand appears in se-

Welland contingent. Swithin & some older ones were nearly the last. When walking at the heels of Mr Torkingham, he passed Lady Constantine's pew, he lifted his eyes from the red lining of that gentleman's hood sufficiently high to catch hers. She was abstracted, tearful — absorbed, & rapt and communing with all the rapt mingling of religion, love, fervour, & hope of which such women can feel at such times, & which in its fulness men know nothing of, & he felt ashamed of his own utter lack of the high enthusiasm that beamed so eloquently from her eyes. When he passed her again on the return journey from the bishop to his seat, her face was warm with a blush, which her brother might have observed had he regarded her.

Whether he had observed it or not, as soon as St. Cleeve had seated himself down again, Louis Glanville turned & looked hard at the young astronomer. This was the first time that St Cleeve & Viviette's brother had been face to face. Swithin was not in the habit of noticing people's features — he scarcely ever observed any detail of physiognomy in his friends, a generalization from their whole aspect being his idea of them — & he now only noted a young man of, perhaps, thirty, who dressed a good deal, & in whose small dark eyes seemed to be concentrated the activity that the rest of his frame decidedly lacked. This gentleman's eyes were thenceforward to the end of the service continually fixed upon Swithin, but as this was their natural direction from the position of his seat there was no great strangeness in the circumstance.

Swithin wanted to say to Viviette: "Now I hope you are pleased; I

A PAGE OF THE *DUPLICATE* MANUSCRIPT, SHOWING THREE CORRECTIONS BY HARDY WHICH NEVER SAW PRINT

quences of pages (*e.g.*, 209-211, 251-259, and 277-281) such as are not found among the sheets that went to the printer.

Aldrich's absence in Europe thus accounts for the hybrid nature of the manuscript which was preserved in the house at Portsmouth. If he had not gone away, he might have retrieved from the printer all the pages of the original and might have discarded *all* the pages of the duplicate, as he apparently discarded those of five of the eight installments, clipping only the title from page one. But thanks to this chance loss of three-eighths of the original manuscript, we are able to learn something about the author and his methods of work—something we might otherwise never have had any way of knowing.

Comment has already been made on the fact that Hardy's holograph was often a rough draft, with interlineations, second-thoughts, suppressions, insertions, and the like. It might be supposed, however, that once the manuscript had been called "finished," ready to send off to Aldrich, it would remain unchanged, and that the duplicate manuscript to be sent by a later ship would faithfully "duplicate" the text of the novel as set down in the original copy. This supposition would, however, be false. For it is clear that, because of the pressure of time and because of Hardy's eagerness not to cause the *Atlantic* any embarrassment by a delay in the arrival of copy for the next installment, he was unable to retain the autograph pages in his hands long enough to satisfy himself that he would not wish to make any further changes. As a result, he returned to the task of revision, even after the original manuscript had been dispatched, and more than once made changes, chiefly fresh insertions, in the "duplicate," which thus did not maintain correspondence with the original. Since the "duplicate" sheets were *not* sent to the printer, and since the *Atlantic* text was therefore not set up from them, the printed text of the novel failed to make use of these last-minute emendations by the author and they have survived nowhere except in these pages

from the "duplicate" manuscript. Hence, by the accident of Aldrich's absence, the so-called "duplicate" pages have been rendered unique, in the case of these last-minute corrections.

Thus, in Chapter 24 in the September installment, Hardy wrote "bevy" in the original manuscript, and the *Atlantic* accordingly set up and printed "bevy." The duplicate manuscript faithfully copied the word "bevy," but at the last minute Hardy struck the word out and substituted "contingent"—a word that never reached the typesetter's eye. Similarly, Hardy had copied "when, at the heels" into the duplicate manuscript, thus following the original, from which the *Atlantic* was set up. But then, on a last inspection of the page before dispatching it to Aldrich, Hardy inserted, with a finer pen and in a darker ink, the word "walking," just before the preposition "at," but the addition got no farther. A third illustration of such still-born emendations: Hardy wrote of "the rapt mingling of religion . . . and hope . . . which men know nothing of," and the sentence was so copied in the duplicate manuscript. The original reached the *Atlantic* printer and was set up accordingly; but before the duplicate left Hardy's hand, he inserted "in its fulness" between "which" and "men."

Such after-thoughts as these never blossomed into print but, unduplicated, remain solely in the pages of the "duplicate" manuscript. This loss is often unfortunate, for Hardy's first thoughts were not always his best thoughts. A third or a fourth attempt at a word or a phrase often succeeded, and in his persistent efforts at subtler refinements of meaning he was often more successful at the end than at the beginning. In this search for the right word, he finally preferred "partner" to "match," "a movement" to "certain sounds," and "excommunicatory" to "excommunicating." He decided that "I'll go on reading" was clearer than "I'll read," and that "vehement firmness" was better than a mere "vehemence." But not one of these readings got into the *Atlantic*, and only the last one ("vehement firmness") managed to reap-

pear in the London three-volume edition, for reasons which I shall state later.

III

There are, of course, a great many words in the manuscript which show slight differences from the text as printed in the *Atlantic*—differences, for example, between English and American spelling. Where Hardy wrote "ploughed" and "waggon," the *Atlantic* printed "plowed" and "wagon." And a score of words which Hardy spelled with "—our" the *Atlantic* printed in "—or," for example, "arbor," "color," and "labor." Changes of this sort the typesetters could doubtless make without special instruction from the *Atlantic* office; but in at least two instances their unfamiliarity with Hardy's handwriting led, in the printed text, to departures from what Hardy had written—departures which survive in the text of the book to this day. Since both these instances occur in the pages which survive from the duplicate manuscript only—sheets which never went to the printer—it is impossible to say which typesetter it was whose faulty eyes were responsible for the spurious words. On page 230 Hardy wrote "occurred" (*it occurred to her*), but the compositor set up "seemed"; the proofreader did not detect the error, for the word made sense, even though it was a sense different from what Hardy intended, and the changeling thus crept into the book unnoticed. Similarly, Hardy wrote "argue" (*I cannot argue with you*), but the printer set up "agree." It, too, made sense, even though it was a very different sense from Hardy's intention. The change slipped by undetected and it has now, I suppose, become a permanent fixture in the text.

Differences of the sort that I have been pointing out, between the author's manuscript and the text as printed in the *Atlantic Monthly*, have all had simple, if not immediately obvious, explanations. But there are others which demand more careful attention—differences which cannot have been caused by "correc-

tions" made by even the most intelligent typesetter. First of all, there is the matter of punctuation. It is clear that Thomas Hardy's punctuation did not meet the standards of the *Atlantic Monthly*, and that a careful hand went over his text before it appeared in print. Hardy wrote "Oh.". The *Atlantic* printed "Oh!". In two sentences that follow, Hardy was satisfied to use two periods, nothing more; but the *Atlantic* inserted five commas, thus: "A few days later, the same lady, in the same carriage, passed that spot again. Her eyes, as before, turned to the distant tower." Hardy was often inconsistent: on page 62 he wrote "Oh-no;" and on page 64 "Oh, yes,". The *Atlantic* regularized these into "Oh, no," and "Oh, yes," and it tidied up the careless use of exclamation marks, and insisted that questions end with question marks. Hardy had (as I pointed out in the *New England Quarterly* article of four years ago) authorized Aldrich to correct mistakes—"If you notice an obvious error please correct it on your own responsibility"—and there is no reason to suppose that the novelist had any objection to this improvement in his punctuation. Aldrich had assured him on April 3, 1882: "Your proof shall be read with sympathetic care." But it will be well to pause here a moment, in order to obtain a clear understanding of just what the *Atlantic* editor meant when he talked about reading proof with care.

Bliss Perry's testimony is clear-cut: "Himself a fastidious composer and reviser, Mr. Aldrich was severely critical of . . . verses of recent years. . . . More than once I have heard him declare that he would have rejected Mr. Kipling's 'Recessional' if it had been offered to the *Atlantic*,—so extreme was his dislike for one or two harsh lines in that justly celebrated poem."[2] And prose fared just as poorly as limping verse, when it was subjected to the same severely critical eye. Aldrich's biographer observes: "It was under Aldrich . . . that the *Atlantic* won its international reputation as being . . . 'the best edited magazine in the English language.' To his

[2] Bliss Perry, *Park-Street Papers* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1908), pp. 144-145.

fastidious sense . . . , reading proof was a sacrament. If he habitually delegated the celebration of it to his assistant, his interest in the result was none the less keen, and it fared ill with any split infinitive . . . that fell under his searching eye."[3]

Now it so happened that Hardy was what Lionel Johnson called "an inveterate patron of the split infinitive." When his manuscript reached the *Atlantic* office, "to seriously conjecture," "to coolly advance," "to flatly stultify," and "to frankly speak out" were all quietly re-arranged—in the first three cases by putting the adverb first, and in the fourth instance by putting it last. When, however, Aldrich went abroad for the summer of 1882, he left the entire job of proof-reading to his assistant. It is high time that we identified her. Ferris Greenslet remarks:

> Of the daily work in the [*Atlantic*] office the present writer is fortunate in being able to present an account by the hand of Miss S. M. Francis, Aldrich's assistant for the nine years of his editorship, who has known the ways of many editors of the *Atlantic*. . . . [She says:] "As an editor Mr. Aldrich lived from hand to mouth . . . . A slovenly or careless style in any sort of article would almost obscure whatever other merit the paper might possess."[4]

Miss Francis was no mere office girl, able only to correct punctuation or to file letters. She was a woman of independent mind, of critical discernment, and of long experience. She had been with the *Atlantic Monthly* almost from its very beginning, and her name deserves to be remembered, if only for one act in her career. The *Overland Monthly* was founded in July, 1868, with Bret Harte as its editor.

> The opening number . . . contained no "distinctive Californian romance," as Bret Harte expressed it . . . . For the second number the editor supplied . . . *The Luck of Roaring Camp*. . . . The return mail from the East . . . brought . . . a letter from the editor of the *Atlantic Monthly* with a request . . . that he would write a story for the *Atlantic*, similar to the *Luck*. It should be recorded . . . that it was . . . Miss Susan M. Francis, a literary assistant with the publishers of the

[3] Ferris Greenslet, *Thomas Bailey Aldrich* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1928) [first edition, 1908], p. 147.

[4] Greenslet, *op. cit.*, pp. 142-144.

Atlantic Monthly, who, struck by the freshness and beauty of the tale, brought it to the attention of Mr. James T. Fields, then the editor of the magazine.[5]

Three years later, Bret Harte accepted the offer of the publishers of the *Atlantic* to pay him $10,000 during the ensuing year for whatever he might write in the next twelve months. His sky-rocketing into fame was partly the result of the prompt action of Susan Francis, who had needed no critical help in recognizing the literary merit of *The Luck of Roaring Camp*.

By the time Aldrich had succeeded to the editorship of the *Atlantic*, Miss Francis had become one of the "old-timers" in the office. The editor's frequent absence contributed to her establishment, in fact, if not in name, as the office-director. Her conscientious rule was recognized by those who had frequent occasion to visit the *Atlantic* office. Sarah Orne Jewett, whose *The Mate of the Daylight* accompanied Hardy's *Two on a Tower* through the 1882 *Atlantic*, was such a person. When she wrote Editor Aldrich an unusually extended and time-consuming epistle (now in the Houghton Library at Harvard), she added: "Please forgive such a long letter. Don't let Miss Francis see you reading it in office hours!!"

To return to Hardy's manuscript: When Aldrich went abroad, the responsibility for all the proof-reading fell to Susan Francis. And in the very first installment she let a split infinitive get by! "To inconveniently crowd" scarred a page of the *Atlantic*, was thence transferred to the book, and remains in the text of the novel to this day (Chapter 26). In spite of this catastrophe, however, Miss Francis took her responsibilities with all seriousness. In fact, they weighed so heavily upon her mind that she never forgot that summer. Twenty years later, when Bliss Perry had become editor of the *Atlantic*, she was still talking about it. She told him about Hardy's shocking story, and thirty years later still, he put her reminiscences on record:

[5] Henry C. Merwin, *The Life of Bret Harte* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1911), pp. 46-47.

When our proof-readers . . . posed problems too subtle for an inexperienced editor to solve, I could fall back upon the trained instinct of Miss Susan Francis, . . . formerly the assistant of Fields, Howells, and Aldrich. It was she . . . who, when Aldrich was studying vintages in Hungary, had to delete on her own responsibility certain passages from Hardy's *Two on a Tower*—then running serially—to avoid offending the decorums of that era.[6]

There is no denying the fact that there are "certain passages" in the manuscript which were pretty certain of "offending the decorums of that era," but I have found none which Miss Francis deleted. They all appear in the printed *Atlantic*. She did make changes, and there *were* passages that doubtless offended her; but it appears likely that her memory, after another quarter-century had rolled by, became confused as to the details. Aldrich himself wrote Hardy, in the letter which I quoted in *The New England Quarterly* four years ago (p. 688), that "the concluding chapters of *Two on a Tower* were not quite in the line of the *Atlantic*." Susan Francis may well have *wished* to delete parts of them. Another New England woman—Harriet W. Preston—went even further and expressed the wish that Hardy had left the entire tale untold.[7] But the manuscript itself, when compared with the printed version in the *Atlantic*, stands as a contradiction of the statement that passages were deleted "to avoid offending the decorums of that era."

In view of Miss Francis's censorious memory of the events of the summer of 1882, it may be that she was responsible for the verbal changes which I have previously called "Aldrich's corrections." In the 1942 *New England Quarterly* (p. 687), I stated that "Aldrich saved the novelist from at least one ignorant blunder." Here again, perhaps Susan Francis rather than Aldrich held the editorial blue pencil. Was she the one who reduced Lady Constantine's age by two years? Hardy wrote that his Lady

[6] Bliss Perry, *And Gladly Teach* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1935), p. 168. My attention has been called to this passage by Dean Marguerite Roberts, of McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada.

[7] See *Century Magazine*, July 1893, p. 355.

was "of about eight and twenty." The "eight" in the manuscript is very clearly written. Yet the *Atlantic* printed "six and twenty." Hardy did not approve of this change and when the novel was published in book form, Viviette was made "a lady about eight- or nine-and-twenty" and so she remains in the definitive edition of the novel. The "corrections" in the *Atlantic* are not always matters of such details, and it is not always easy to surmise why the change was made. Hardy wrote: "In one hand he had a valise." The *Atlantic* printed: "He had a valise in one hand." Hardy wrote: "with no surprise." The *Atlantic* changed this to "without any surprise." When Hardy made one of his characters say, " I can only stay for five minutes," the *Atlantic* properly amended the speech to "I can stay only five minutes." This sort of correcting looks like the work of Aldrich's hand, and he may be the one, or it may have been Miss Francis, who prevented Hardy from saying in print what he had written in ink: "She . . . descended away from the spot." The *Atlantic* printed: "She . . . descended the staircase." This change, obviously an improvement, is only one of many instances of Hardy's indebtedness to one or the other pair of critical eyes in the office of the *Atlantic Monthly;* for these emendations were in most cases transferred from the magazine to the printed book and have thus become part of the authorized text.

IV

In *most* cases, I have said; but not in all cases. How is this fact to be explained? The question brings us face to face with a fresh problem. Hardy had asked Aldrich for printed sheets from the *Atlantic* "as soon as possible for nominal publication here on account of copyright."[8] He had told Aldrich that "Half a dozen copies will . . . be enough." Aldrich, either ignoring or forgetting the "half a dozen," wrote on March 7, 1882: "A printed copy of the present installment [i.e., for May] is to be sent to you in time to enable you to copyright the work." It was doubtless this "print-

[8] *New England Quarterly,* XV: 689 (December 1942).

ed copy" or others like it, sent later, which Hardy used when Sampson Low, Marston, Searle and Rivington came to publish the novel in three volumes in London on October 25 of that year. The British Museum copy was received on November 2, 1882.

In the case of the early installments, there was, of course, sufficient time for the receipt of printed sheets from the *Atlantic*; and the British first edition of the novel retains the *Atlantic's* punctuation, the *Atlantic's* wedded infinitives as well as the one split infinitive which Susan Francis let get by. Where Hardy had written "window" (in Chapter 10), the *Atlantic* inadvertently printed "windows," and the London first edition retained the "s". In general, that is, the London book faithfully followed the *Atlantic* text, merely restoring British spellings such as "ploughman," "colour," and "waggon." But beginning with the first page of the November installment (i.e., Chapter 33 to the end), the London first edition *fails* to follow the *Atlantic* text; and emendations made in the last two installments of the serialization were lost to the book. Two infinitives, split in the manuscript—"to thoroughly examine" and "to honestly sign"—were amended in the *Atlantic*: Miss Francis didn't let them *all* get by! But the first London edition of the novel restores the faulty version of the manuscript. The explanation is a simple one. The London publishers could not wait for the November and December sheets from the *Atlantic*; in order to have their book ready in time to publish in late October, they had to be supplied with "copy" in time for the printing to be done in England simultaneously with the last two parts of the American serialization. Hardy therefore must have supplied Sampson Low with a manuscript; that is, for the last two installments there must have been a third manuscript, one following more or less faithfully the two American manuscripts, of which there now survive the duplicate manuscript for the November part, retrieved by Aldrich upon his return to Boston, and the original manuscript for the December part. In the *New England Quarterly* article of 1942, I made the statement (p. 687) that

"the first English edition . . . was printed . . . from a manuscript supplied to the London publishers." The detailed study of the Houghton Library manuscript now makes it clear that the London book was printed from *Atlantic Monthly* sheets for six out of the eight installments, and that only for the last two installments was Hardy called upon to supply his London publisher with an independent or triplicate manuscript.

One final observation: I have identified three kinds of changes made in New England in the text of the novel as written in old England—changes in spelling, such as a typesetter could make; changes in punctuation, such as Miss Francis could authorize; changes in word-order to meet Aldrich's fastidious demands; but I have said nothing about the mechanics by which these changes were effected. There are no corrections made by Aldrich or Miss Francis in the extant sandwich-manuscript. It is clear that they did not write their instructions for the printer on Hardy's autograph sheets. Professor Perry has told the present writer that it was customary in his days as editor of the *Atlantic* for corrections and emendations to be made on the galley-proofs. The four typesetters whose names are found in crayon or pencil on the manuscript must have set up just what they found there (always excepting the obvious changes in spelling, in conformity to national practice). Then, when the galley-proofs came to Miss Francis's desk, she presumably indicated *on them* what changes should be made before the paging was begun. And only when the corrected proofs, in final page form, were ready, did Aldrich look at them. Greenslet's statement that Aldrich "habitually delegated" the proof-reading "to his assistant" is in complete agreement with the report given me by Professor Perry. In his day corrections were still made on galley-proofs; Miss Francis supervised this part of the task of bringing the work of undisciplined authors into line with *Atlantic* custom; and the editor cast his eye upon the proofs only when clean, paged "revises" were ready. The result of this practice is that Hardy's manuscript remains free of all printer's

scars, except for the compositors' names and the place-marks associated with them.

Our examination of the manuscript thus brings us to the conclusion that *Two on a Tower* presents an unusual and extremely complicated history. There are four sets of twins: first, two different, interspersed handwritings; second, two separate manuscripts, each only partially extant; third, there are two critics at work in the *Atlantic* office, one particularly active while the other was in Europe; and fourth, there are two distinct paths discernible in tracing the provenance of the three-volume edition published in London. These tangled threads, confusing though they seem to be, show us the novelist and his wife at work, enable us to see him composing and revising, her copying and re-copying; and to see Susan Francis and "the Duke of Ponkapog" (as Sarah Orne Jewett used to call Aldrich) putting their heads together in disapproval of Hardy's split infinitives and in dismay at the untidy appearance of his manuscript as well as at the offensive conduct of his characters.

In a preface which Hardy wrote for this novel in 1895, he referred to it as "this imperfect story." What we have learned of its hasty and piecemeal composition, its duplicate revision, and its transatlantic emendation, enables us to understand better why it is imperfect. Two lovers on Hardy's English tower led to a tragedy; three hands beside his own on his New England manuscript certainly did not lead to a supreme work of art.

The Groans of Great Britain: an Unassigned Tract by Charles Gildon[1]

By John Robert Moore

I

Les Soupirs de la Grand Britaigne: Or, The Groans of Great Britain (London, 1713),[2] a vehement attack on contemporary English life and manners and morals and public spirit, private patronage and public taste, high-flying clergymen and Italian operas, has been so effectively mislaid by library cataloguers and by literary historians that it has never been claimed for its true author.

Without sharing any hope of discovering what song the sirens sang, one may well feel chagrined that a 92-page tract, dealing with a wide range of specific topics in an intensely individualistic manner, has never been properly assigned. It will not do to dismiss the tract to "an unknown hack"; it is too obviously written to express strong personal views rather than to appeal primarily to the casual buyer. In the Age of Queen Anne, the author may well have been a Diogenes of the Augustans, but his was no mere mercenary pen. The tract stands, like a gnarled old forest tree unclassified in the midst of a botanical garden, to shame our skill in attributing authorship from abundant internal evidence.

[1] For some suggestions which have been adopted in this paper, I am indebted to Professor Edward D. Seeber of Indiana University.

[2] I have been unable to see *The Groans of Great-Britain* (1753), listed by Pickering & Chatto Ltd. (Catalogue No. 331, p. 30) as the first edition. From the long description, this 1753 tract (aside from the omission of the pretended French title) would seem to differ very little from that of 1713.

II

According to Barbier's *Dictionnaire des ouvrages anonymes* (Paris, Daffis, 1879), IV, Jean Dumont, baron de Carlscroon, was the author of a work which appeared in 1712 with the title *Les Soupirs de l'Europe à la veüe du projet de paix contenu dans la harangue de la reine de la Grande-Bretagne à son Parlement, du 6–7 juin 1712*. In 1713 this volume was "Made English from the Original French" and printed (perhaps in England, perhaps in Holland, without the name of place or publisher) as *Les Soupirs de l'Europe &c. Or, The Groans of Europe at the Prospect of the Present Posture of Affairs. In a Letter from a Gentleman at the Hague to a Member of Parliament.*

This tract, a violent but tedious protest by a propagandist for the Emperor against the plan of the Tory administration to give up Spain to the House of Anjou at Utrecht, seems to have been rather widely circulated as a Whig pamphlet. It was in line with the policy of the Whig leaders, and copies of it are not scarce today.

As of the same date (1713)[3] and under the imprint of John Baker in London appeared an almost equally long tract,[4] the title of which (partly in very bad French) made a pretense that it was a sequel to Dumont's work, but which thereafter made no reference to its predecessor. The new tract was entitled *Les Soupirs de la Grand Britaigne: Or, The Groans of Great Britain, Being The Sec-*

[3] So on the title-page; but according to the Old Style calendar, the new year would begin on March 25 and the main treaties of Utrecht were signed on March 31. We need not suppose that either tract was issued during that brief interval. Although it is usual to accept the date given on the title-page of an early eighteenth-century book or pamphlet, we should remember that (quite aside from intentional deceptions, whereby old books were issued as new ones or new ones as old) two common practices among publishers made such dates uncertain: (1) Although the Old Style year began officially on March 25, books and periodicals were often dated from January 1 or shortly thereafter (as the *Review* and *The Spectator*). (2) Then, as now, publishers disliked to injure the sale of a new book which appeared near the end of a year, and they frequently made use of the new year's date. It is for this reason that so many of Defoe's works are tentatively assigned to January, the earliest month in which the new date would be correct. For an extreme case of post-dating, the third volume of Defoe's *Tour* (1727) was apparently issued on August 13, 1726 (cf. G. D. H. Cole's reprint, London, 1927, I:xxv).

[4] [vi]+92+[8] pp.

ond Part to the Groans of Europe. The similarity of title might be intended to increase the sale of the tract, at a time when England was intensely aware of the diplomatic negotiations in progress at Utrecht; but perhaps more likely it was intended to catch the eye of the Whig readers with its implied protest that the internal affairs of England were more important than anything happening at the peace conference. The isolationist view of the author was expressed on the title-page by a quotation beginning, "*En quo Discordia Cives!*"

This latter tract has been hastily assigned to two different men, both of whom should be dismissed from consideration here:

(1) To Jean Dumont, to whom it bears no possible relationship except in the travesty of his title. So far from being a translation from the French, this tract is intensely English; and the point of view, the purpose, and the manner are so utterly unlike those of Dumont that the most casual inspection should convince anyone that he was not the author.

(2) To Daniel Defoe, on the expansive principle so often followed that any anonymous tract in English, from the year of his birth to the second decade after his death, must have been his. The range of Defoe's interests was so vast that one can expect to find something like him in almost any writing of the age. The tract refers to the unsuccessful attempt of Brooks and Hellier to supply unadulterated wine to the London market (which Defoe had advertised and discussed in the *Review*); and there are glimpses of several of his ideas, such as the sufferings of debtors, a more rational enforcement of the Sunday closing laws, the evils of parties, and the extravagance of political parsons.

But the style, the violent and humorless tone, the elaborate display of classical learning, and most of the ideas of literary criticism are quite unlike anything by Defoe—especially in 1712-1713, when his pen was so largely devoted to the absorbing problems of the Treaty of Utrecht. More specifically, *The Groans of*

Great Britain was largely an attack on modern music. The author sneered at the reward given "to a *French* Piper for a few Tunes on the *Haut Bois*," he insisted that music is at best an imitation of the human voice and that it expresses sound without reason, he argued that music should be subordinate to drama and poetry and should not be allowed as a separate entertainment of any length, and he condemned opera as a "paltry Diversion" which had corrupted society as well as the stage.

In *Augusta Triumphans* (1728) Defoe not only controverted every objection to music in *The Groans of Great Britain,* but he gave higher and more intelligent praise to musical education and performance than is to be found in the writings of any of his principal contemporaries. (Cf. especially pp. 16, 17, 18–19, 20–21, 22, and 23.) It is incredible that *The Groans of Great Britain* could have been written by such a lover of music as Defoe.

Most of the other principal writers of the day—Steele and Addison and Swift among them—condemned opera almost in the very words of the tract, as an art which subordinated reason and as a social influence which corrupted the morals; but one can dismiss the possibility that any of them wrote it. The tract contains several sneers at Swift and a jibe at Pope, it is contemptuous of *The Spectator* and condescending toward the poetry of Prior. In addition, it is openly hostile to most of the political journals of the day, it displays personal bitterness toward the Drury Lane clique and the aristocratic patrons of Italian opera, it is unsympathetic toward High-Churchmen and Tories without seeking the support of Dissenters and Whigs.

But through all its windings, it follows the ideas, and sometimes the very words, of the great Critic of the Augustan Age. If one were to adopt the cautious practice of connoisseurs of Renaissance painting, one might with some confidence assign this tract to the *School of Dennis.* Was there any contemporary writer who shared Dennis's enthusiasms and prejudices to this extent?

III

The great similarity between the ideas of Charles Gildon and those of John Dennis has not been entirely overlooked. Professor Hooker has remarked,

> Gildon regarded Dennis as his master, and took every opportunity to praise him, characterizing him as the most consummate critic of the age. In view of this fact it is probable that the similarities in their critical opinions are partly the effect of Dennis's influence upon Gildon . . . . Gildon, like Dennis, commented on the degeneracy of taste in his time, assigning much the same reasons for it as Dennis did (cf. *Post-Man Robb'd of His Mail*, pp. 109-113); he inveighed against the Italian opera in a manner suggestive of Dennis (*ibid.*, pp. 111-112); he fulminated against dramatists who prepared the way for their plays by raising cabals to favor them (*ibid.*, p. 149); he accused the enemies of the theater of being Jacobites (*ibid.*, pp. 212-213); he defended the drama by contending that it was the least harmful of all diversions (*ibid.*, pp. 215-216); he attributed the corruption of the stage to the fact that the management of the theater was in the hands of ignorant players (*ibid.*, p. 265); he protested against the use of rhyme in English poetry (*Laws of Poetry*, pp. 65 and 121); he argued in favor of enthusiasm in poetry (*ibid.*, p. 75); he attacked Steele for condemning the regularity of the French stage (*ibid.*, p. 177); he stressed the importance of humour in comedy, and defined it in exactly the same way as Dennis had (*ibid.*, pp. 251-252). These are but a few of the obvious similarities which indicate how closely Gildon followed his master.[5]

Gildon's admiration of Dennis did not end "this side idolatry." He regarded Dennis's wooden blank verse as perfection, and preferred his verse translations to the King James version of Habakkuk and of the eighteenth Psalm.[6] He declared *Paradise Lost* the best of poems, but bracketed Dennis and Milton as the two great sacred poets.[7] He could not end his life of Wycherley without dragging in four letters from Wycherley to Dennis; and in *The Post-Man Robb'd of His Mail* (London, A. Bettsworth, 1719), pp. 104-105, he went out of his way to shower praise on Dennis's long-forgotten scheme for correcting naval abuses.

[5] *The Critical Works of John Dennis*, ed. E. N. Hooker (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1939-1943), II:lxi; note 89, lxi-lxii.

[6] *The Laws of Poetry* (London, Hinchliffe and Walthoe, 1721), pp. 65-68, 117-121.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 121; *Miscellaneous Letters and Essays* (London, B. Bragg, 1694), p. 44.

At times the phrasing of the same idea in Dennis and in Gildon is so similar that one has difficulty in remembering the source from which a particular quotation is drawn. In the *School of Dennis*, Gildon was surely the aptest pupil, if not frequently the only one. If Dennis had an *alter ego*, Gildon was the man.

IV

One of the most marked characteristics of Gildon's writings was his repetition of favorite phrases or passages. If he used material one time, he was likely to employ it again. He wrote an insolent letter to Prior,[8] telling him how a great man had (for a previous gift of one of Gildon's books) presented him with twenty guineas—the price of ten new pamphlets from a good party writer during much of Defoe's career. Gildon was willing enough to demand the money from Prior or any other, but he had no such facility as Defoe in writing the pamphlets.

The repetitions in Gildon sometimes involve only phrases or brief statements, but they sometimes extend to passages of many pages. For an example of the former kind, we have a statement which recurs in *The Golden Spy* (London, Woodward and Morphew, 1709):

(P. 10) From the Courtiers I easily pass'd to the Gamesters; those, tho' never such Scoundrels by Birth and Parts, are admitted to the Tables of Lords and Princes: nay, this very one thing has brought the Lacquey from behind his Lords Chair, to the Table with him. And the Ostler from rubbing the Horses Heels, into the Bed with a Dutchess.

(P. 128) I could give you the Characters of several other Gamesters in *Paris*, who have rais'd themselves from the Coach Tail to their Lord's Table and Lady's Bed, . . . you can't pass the Streets without seeing Sharpers as well as Quacks in their Coaches.

(P. 156) The vulgar Sharper generally rises from the Refuse and Scum of the People, and . . . is qualify'd to stick at no Roguery that will . . . raise him to make a figure in a Coach, whose original Station, both by Nature and Fortune, was at its Tail.

[8] Francis Bickley, *The Life of Matthew Prior* (London, Pitman, 1914), pp. 264-265.

The same idea recurs in *The Post-Man Robb'd of His Mail* (1719):

(P. 43) ... [the Sharper's] is so modish an Employ, that it can bring the Footman from the Coach Tail to his Lord's Table, and sometimes to his Lady's Bed.

If Gildon wrote *The Groans of Great Britain*, one would expect such a favorite passage to reappear there; and so it does, not once but twice:

(P. 31) ... [our Great Men] admit Sharpers to a Familiarity, tho' they rose from the Tap or the Coach Tail.

(P. 72) ... Gaming, which gives Admission to Sharpers, rising from the Black Guard and Coach Tail, to the Board, with Men and Women of Quality, ...

In *The Laws of Poetry* (1721) Gildon related the following anecdote:

(Pp. 23-24) *Euripides* writ a play upon *Bellerophon*, in which he brings in *Bellerophon* speaking in the praise of money, and the advantages it procures to man; the whole audience rose up, and would not let the play go on, till *Euripides* came out upon the stage, and said to them: *Gentlemen, 'tis true, I have brought on* BELLEROPHON *speaking in vindication of avarice; but I beg your patience only to see how I punish him before the end of the* TRAGEDY; upon which the audience were appeas'd, and went away satisfy'd with the punishment the poet had inflicted on the transgressor.

The same anecdote had been told in *The Post-Man Robb'd of His Mail:*

(P. 286) ... when *Euripides*, in his Play of *Bellerophon*, had made that Prince speak in the Vindication of Avarice; the whole Audience rose up and interrupted the Action, till *Euripides* came out on the Stage, and desired them to have patience till they saw how he punish'd him for what he had said. This appeas'd them, and *Bellerophon's* Punishment made them go away well satisfy'd.

If Gildon wrote *The Groans of Great Britain*, one would not be surprised to find this same anecdote told there; and so it is:

(P. 61) ... when *Bellerophon*, in a Play of that Name, spoke much in the Praise of Mony and the Vindication of Avarice, (which Speech is still extant in the Fragments of *Euripides*) the whole Audience rose up and put a stop to the Play till *Euripides* came on the Stage, and desired their Patience to see how he had punish'd him, who made that Speech; on which they sat down, and saw *Bellerophon* punished according to his desert, with a great deal of Satisfaction.

In *The Laws of Poetry* Gildon related these two anecdotes:

(Pp. 26-27) When *Lysander* had taken *Athens*, it was debated among the commanders of *Sparta*, whether they should destroy the city, or not; and, after many arguments *pro* and *con*, the more favourable resolution of sparing it was taken, by the influence of some verses out of the *Electra* of *Euripides*, which were repeated to the chiefs upon that occasion. . . . When *Nicias*, the *Athenian* general, was routed, and his whole army dissipated, and in great part destroy'd, many of those who escaped the fight and slaughter, not only saved their lives, but furnish'd themselves with abilities to get home to their own country, by repeating to, and teaching the *Sicilians* several of the verses of *Euripides*.

The same anecdotes had been told, in conjunction, in *The Post-Man Robb'd of His Mail:*

(Pp. 286-287) . . . when *Lysander* had taken *Athens*, and it was debated whether the City shou'd be destroy'd, upon hearing some Verses out of the *Electra*, that General spar'd *Athens*, and return'd Home.

After *Nicias* was routed in *Sicily*, and his Army almost destroy'd, many of the Soldiers sav'd their Lives only by repeating some Verses out of *Euripides*.

If Gildon wrote *The Groans of Great Britain*, it would not be astonishing if these anecdotes were told in conjunction there; and so they are:

(Pp. 64-65) . . . *Euripides*, to whose Verses afterwards they ow'd the Preservation of *Athens*, when taken by *Lysander*, as we have it in *Plutarch*. When it was debated (says he) that the City of *Athens* shou'd be destroyed, and the Country laid waste, a milder Course was taken by the Commanders, one of them, repeating these Verses out of the *Electra* of *Euripides* . . . after the Rout of their Forces . . . the *Sicilians* spar'd many of them for the sake of *Euripides*, and for repeating and teaching his Verses.

Possibly these and more than forty-five other brief passages might be the product of a retentive memory, working over familiar themes. But in several long passages it is clear that *The Post-Man Robb'd of His Mail* contains direct borrowings from *The Groans of Great Britain* (unless, as the author of *The Groans of Great Britain* professed, these long passages were themselves borrowed from an earlier manuscript).

Letters VI, VII, and VIII of Book II of *The Post-Man Robb'd of His Mail* (pp. 93-107) are ostensibly addressed to "My Lord" as a protest against the avarice of the nobility, who should be generous patrons of literature. But all this material had appeared previously in *The Groans of Great Britain* (pp. 18-30) in *identical form* (except for the omission of a few lines, the modification of the end-links of the letters so as to make a continuous statement, and slight changes of phrases here and there). The close relationship between these two passages can be indicated by contrasting the two beginnings:

The Groans of Great Britain	*The Post-Man Robb'd of His Mail*
(P. 18) Avarice being so general and so prevalent in this Nation, I shall give a Copy of a Memorial presented to a Person of high Degree on this Head, and who is as eminent for his Avarice as his Quality. Among other things recommending a public Spirit he says—	
Our Nobility (*says this Manuscript*) have not enough weigh'd the Nature of Government in general, . . .	(P. 93) *My Lord*, Our Nobility have not enough weigh'd the Nature of Government in general, . . .

Likewise, Letter IX of Book II of *The Post-Man Robb'd of His Mail* (pp. 109–113) is identical with pages 75–79 of *The Groans of Great Britain* except for the omission or alteration of several lines near the top of page 78 and very minor changes here and there throughout. In a few places, as where "the degeneracy of the Gentry and Great Ones" is altered to the more euphonious phrase "the Degeneracy of the Great Men," it would seem that the text of *The Post-Man Robb'd of His Mail* represents a revised version.

In other passages (*The Groans of Great Britain*, pp. 16–17; *The Post-Man Robb'd of His Mail*, pp. 107, 303–304) we find not only the same Latin quotations offered at length, and the same translations of those quotations, but even approximately the same commentary on the quotations.

V

It is true that many tracts of the early eighteenth century were put together by literary hacks through wholesale plagiarism of publications by other men.[9] But there are two very strong reasons for considering this author a zealot or a crank rather than a thief:

(1) *The Groans of Great Britain* is a consistent expression of very strongly held views.

(2) Those views were among the least likely to advance the popularity of the author or the sale of the tract.

Professor Durham remarked concerning Gildon's *The Complete Art of Poetry* (1718), "Whatever the cause of his change of front, it was certainly not the desire to be with the crowd."[10] The author of *The Groans of Great Britain* was no candidate for popularity.

As I have pointed out before, the ideas expressed in this tract are sketched out in the accepted writings of John Dennis—often in much the same language. But it is only in the writings of Charles Gildon (written at different times on widely different subjects) that those ideas are developed over and over again, often at great length, with such literal precision that they must derive from the same store of memories, or at times from the same manuscript notes.

The voice is indeed the voice of Dennis, but the hand is the hand of Gildon.

[9] Cf. my *Defoe and the Eighteenth Century Pamphlets on London*, in: *Philological Quarterly*, Vol. XX: 38-45 (January, 1941).

[10] W. H. Durham, *Critical Essays of the Eighteenth Century 1700-1725* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1915), p. xix.

The Margins in Mediaeval Books

By Curt F. Bühler[1]

ONE of the most difficult and elusive problems which confronts the historian of the written or printed word is that which concerns itself with what the early printer or scribe intended his book to look like when work on it had been completed. As far as the type or script page is concerned, we are tolerably well informed by the countless manuscripts and incunabula which have been preserved to us in immaculate condition. In most instances, however, the intervening centuries have taken their toll of the margins as the books passed through the hands of the binder (to whom—and, no doubt, in jest—William Morris once referred as "that enemy of books") or successive rebinders. When a book has once been bound, it is no longer possible to determine with complete accuracy what margins have been cropped and how much has been cut off; indeed, the size of the book may well have been cut down, considerably and deliberately, to suit the tastes or needs of the individual purchaser. When the book has gone through several rebindings and has been subjected to similar successive modifications of its original shape, the possibilities for arriving at erroneous conclusions as to the size of the original margins are proportionately greater. It was against just such pitfalls as these that the late Alfred W. Pollard warned in

[1] This paper is dedicated to my friend and colleague of the past dozen years, Mark D. Brewer. For a long time I have wanted to acknowledge publicly the great debt I owe him for his willing assistance wherever his special knowledge of science and mathematics could be of use in the study of mediaeval manuscripts and early printed books. Without his help much that I have written would have been incorrect and valueless. It is singularly fitting, I think, that this paper (which is more practical than theoretical) be dedicated to him. C. F. B.

his two interesting studies entitled *Margins*; the earlier of these appeared in *The Printing Art* (Cambridge, Mass., 1907), X:17-24, and the later in *The Dolphin: A Journal of the Making of Books* (New York, 1933), I:67-80. Bearing Pollard's experiences in mind and complying with his expressed hope that others might continue his researches, I have thought it might be of somewhat more than passing interest to analyze what the scribes and the printers of earlier days believed the margins should measure in the light of three bits of evidence unknown to Pollard and of unquestionable integrity.

For very logical reasons, as Pollard pointed out, it is usual to find in modern books as well as in those of earlier centuries that the inner margin is the smallest, then the upper, next the outer and finally (and largest of them all) the lower. Whether a book is held in one hand or by both hands, as the case may be, it is the lower and the outer margins which the thumbs will grasp. Thus it is perfectly natural that we should here find the greatest amount of white paper, so that the hand holding the book need not cover the text in any way and thus impede the progress of the eye. Again, as William Morris maintained, it is not the single page but two contiguous pages (the opening, as it is generally called) which forms the unit of the book. The inner margin thus becomes a double expanse of white and to avoid making the gutter (as, I understand, printers call this space between the two text-pages) so wide as to be out of all proportion to the other white margins, each inner one is naturally the smallest. Finally, in order to achieve balance, the top margin is fitted to the size of the inner in a proportion somewhat similar to that which the lower margin bears to the outer. It has been stated, but on no very secure grounds, that printers normally adopt a proportion of 1:2:3:4; this, as Pollard showed, is rather too extreme and he suggested the proper proportion might be 2:3:4:5. The actual measurements in the best modern books, however, display a wide choice of modi-

fications according to the taste of the printer, the size of his type and the book, illustrations, and other conditions over which he has no control.

The proportions throughout this study are all based on their relationship to the height of the paper, not only because Pollard employed this criterion and the resulting figures are simple to handle but also (as we shall see) because such proportions have been recognized as suitable means of comparison since very early days. As Pollard has rightly said, it is necessary to compare the inner and outer margin to the height, not to the breadth, of the paper "if we are to advance from the relations of one margin to other margins to the still more important point as to the proportion they should bear to the page of type." As an illustration of what the proportions of the margins to the height of the paper in modern fine printing amounted to, Pollard cited the following figures obtained from several of the Kelmscott editions and from the Doves Bible:

	Lower	*Upper*	*Outer*	*Inner*
Kelmscott Press	23%	9%	17-18%	7%
Doves Press	19%	10%	18%	7%

For a rough estimate, then, we can conclude that the lower margin should be about one-fifth of the total height with the upper margin approximately half that much; the outer margin ought to be nearly four-fifths of the lower while the inner, in turn, just less than half the outer. A modern fine book, Pollard thought, would afford the following approximate percentages:

Page	*Type-page*	*Lower*	*Upper*	*Outer*	*Inner*
100% x 70%	68% x 45%	23%	9%	18%	8%

In such a book, it is interesting to note, the height of the type-page is roughly that of the breadth of the paper and its breadth is approximately two-thirds that of the height of the type-page.

So much for modern books. Previous estimates as to the space left for margins in the books of an earlier epoch have been based

on examples which the investigator hoped were in their original condition, though it is obvious that many copies, if not all of them, had been cut down, no matter how slight and uniform this reduction may have been. Morris quoted a librarian-friend whose estimate, based on a study of the books in his care, was that "the mediaeval rule was to make a difference of 20 per cent from margin to margin." In figures this would mean that, if the inner margin measured 10 millimetres, the upper would be 12mm., the outer 14.4mm., and the lower 17.28mm., roughly 10:12:14⅖:17¼.

The exceptionally large Bodleian copy of the 1459 *Psalter* shows extraordinary variations from page to page in its several dimensions; these may be found in Pollard's paper in *The Dolphin*. On the average we find that the approximate percentages work out to be the following:

Page	*Type-page*	*Lower*	*Upper*	*Outer*	*Inner*
100% x 69½%	70% x 43%	20½%	9½%	17%	9½%

The three handsome fifteenth-century books noted in his earlier paper yielded on the average these percentages:

Page	*Type-page*	*Lower*	*Upper*	*Outer*	*Inner*
100% x 69¾%	68% x 41%	23%	9%	20%	8¾%

while the books printed early in his career by Anton Koberger with their unusually large margins averaged:

Page	*Type-page*	*Lower*	*Upper*	*Outer*	*Inner*
100% x 67%	59% x 35%	27%	14%	18%	14%

If we except the Koberger books with their over-ample margins (a proportion which this printer gradually reduced and finally corrected), the percentages for page, type-page and margins do not greatly differ from those estimated for a modern fine book. All these figures, however, have been compiled from books which have already been bound. Though it is likely that, while these books may have been slightly cut or trimmed here and there, the law of averages would tend to reduce the margin of error, we

cannot be entirely certain that these figures are precisely the same as those which the scribe or printer had in mind when he began his work. We may, therefore, now turn to the new evidence to which reference has already been made.

I am greatly obliged to the late Edward K. Rand for his kindness in bringing to my attention the first piece of concrete evidence regarding the mediaeval concept of what the page proportions should be. This evidence is a marginal note found on folio 2 verso of the ninth-century manuscript Lat. 11884 of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. Although this note has long been known to palaeographers, having first been noticed in the *Neues Archiv* of 1898, it seems to have escaped the notice alike of those bibliographers and of those practitioners of fine printing who have written about the sizes of margins. The text, as printed in Professor Rand's *Studies in the Script of Tours* (II:88), reads:

Taliter debet fieri quaternionis forma, quinta parte longitudinis, quarta latitudinis. Quintam partem da inferiori vel anteriori margini, et ipsam quintam partem diuide in .III. et dabis .II. superiori, subtracta .I. Rursus ipsas .II. partes divide in tres, dabisque duas posteriori margini subtrahendo unam. Huic compar erit si media interfuerit. Lineas vero iuxta rationem scripturae divides, quia maior scriptura latioribus, minor autem strictioribus lineis indiget.

The meaning of this notation is quite clear. Omitting those details which do not concern us, we find that the height of the whole page should be to its breadth as 5 to 4; the lower and outer margins were to be one-fifth of the height, the upper margin two-thirds of this figure and the inner margin two-thirds that of the upper. In percentages this would work out to be:

Page	*Script-page*	*Lower*	*Upper*	*Outer*	*Inner*
100% x 80%	66⅔% x 51⅑%	20%	13⅓%	20%	8⅑%

The proportion of both the breadth of the leaf and that of the script-page to the overall height is noticeably greater than that for the modern fine book. In the ninth century, then, the page was intended to appear a good deal more "squat" than what is ac-

Reduced facsimile *Oratio in laudem sancti Leopoldi*

cepted as the standard now. In contrast we may note the approximate average percentages of the three later British Museum manuscripts which Pollard quoted in his second paper; they are:

Page	*Script-page*	*Lower*	*Upper*	*Outer*	*Inner*
100%x68%	65%x38%	24%	11%	19%	11%

The remaining sets of figures will be obtained from two fifteenth-century printed books which, incredibly enough, for almost half a millenium somehow or other escaped the hand of a binder. These two books (the only ones known to me in this condition) are preserved as the original sheets, unopened at the top and uncut at the sides and bottom; they show no marks of ever having been sewn or otherwise encased in a binding. One of these books, if one may speak of these sheets as such, belongs to Mr. Albert Ehrman, through whose kindness—and with the patient endurance of Mr. H. R. Spandel—I was enabled to examine it and make the necessary measurements; the other happens to be mine.

In order that the reader may see at a glance what these sheets look like, I have reproduced the first one from my copy. The book itself is of no particular consequence or value; its sole interest is in the condition in which it has been preserved. It is the *Oratio in laudem sancti Leopoldi* by Johannes Franciscus de Pavinis, apparently printed in Rome by Eucharius Silber at some unspecified time, but probably not long after the oration was delivered on November 20, 1484. This edition is listed under No. P 211 in Margaret B. Stillwell's *Incunabula in American Libraries* where the pertinent bibliographical references may be found. It is a quarto volume made up of three sheets and the side of the one here reproduced contains the text found on folio 1 recto, 2 verso, 11 recto and 12 verso, i.e., pages 1, 4, 21, and 24. The overall dimensions of the sheet are 450x300mm. Though it may not be possible to detect this in the reproduction, the four pages are not perfectly centered on the sheet. The two type-pages each

measure 87mm. in width and the space between them (the gutter) is 38mm., making a total width from the first character on the left-hand side to the last character on the right-hand side of 212mm. and leaving 88mm. for the outer margins. On two sheets, however, one of the outer margins measures 48mm., while the other but 40mm. To make a perfect book with all the edges even, it would have been ultimately necessary to trim the outer margins of all pages so as to leave a uniform outer margin of no more than 40mm.

Again for the height, a full page of 33 lines measures 145mm., ascenders and descenders included, for a total of 290mm. of printed matter. The space between the pages is a constant 46mm. in height. Thus the space enclosed by the type-pages is 336mm. in height, leaving 114mm. for the lower margins. Here, also, the actual measurement varies between a maximum 62mm. and a minimum 52mm., showing that the pages were not correctly set to the dead center of the sheet. If the edges were to be even, then, the sheet would have to be trimmed to a lower margin no greater than 52mm.

We do not, of course, know with absolute certainty whether the printer expected to leave the greatest possible margins or planned to trim them to some previously determined size. As a practical measure, though, it seems likely that the printer would want to make the maximum use of his sheet, particularly for such a strictly commercial venture as the present book, with its contents of ephemeral interest, represents. Since paper must have been a very considerable item in the mediaeval printer's costs of production (the numerous cancels in place of reprinting whole sheets found in many early printed books certainly indicate a strict economy of paper), it does not seem reasonable to presume that the early printer deliberately used a sheet producing larger margins than was desirable for the bound volume. Such margins would simply have had to be trimmed off and unnecessary wastage of paper would be the only result. It is difficult to come to any other con-

clusion than that the printers of all ages, mediaeval as well as modern, sought to make the best possible use of the paper they had in hand and would plan their books to such proportions that the smallest waste would be incurred. Again, one may also argue, I think, that, for pleasing effect and to conform to manuscript usage, the early printer (contrary to the practice of some modern fine presses) would not favor uneven margins and that he therefore probably trimmed the paper the smallest amount possible under the given circumstances without leaving jagged edges.

The size of the book we have been discussing would then, after trimming and folding, have been 220x146mm.; actually the British Museum copy now measures 208x143mm., the Harvard copy 185x132mm. and the Huntington copy 217x141mm. The measurements and approximate percentages of the finished product would have been:

Page	*Type-page*	*Lower*	*Upper*	*Outer*	*Inner*
220x146 mm.	145x87 mm.	52 mm.	23 mm.	40 mm.	19 mm.
100%x66%	66%x40%	24%	10%	18%	8%

By one of those coincidences which are so incredible that they have to be seen to be believed, Mr. Ehrman's volume (if such it may be called) is another edition of this identical work, printed at Passau by Johann Petri. That it is later in date than my edition seems quite certain, since the Rome edition was probably issued in connection with the canonization of St. Leopold in 1485 and the Passau edition was only a reprint of this. Indeed, Petri is not known to have worked at Passau before 1485 and the type with which he printed Mr. Ehrman's book is his fourth, probably cut about 1489. This edition is listed by Miss Stillwell as P 212. The size of the sheet in this case is 430x320mm. and, making the smallest possible allowance for the essential trimming, the folded leaf would have measured 215x160mm. The actual size of the British Museum copy is 188x137mm., while the copy in the Library of Congress measures 196x140mm. Thus the approximate

measurements and percentages for Mr. Ehrman's book would have been, when bound:

Page	*Type-page*	*Lower*	*Upper*	*Outer*	*Inner*
215x160 mm.	150x97 mm.	40 mm.	25 mm.	40 mm.	23 mm.
100%x74%	70%x45%	18½%	11½%	18½%	10½%

What, then, can we deduce from all these figures? Chiefly, it seems to me, that for the mediaeval book as well as for its modern counterpart no hard and fast rule was observed by the scribes or the master printers of their day. A gradual increase in the proportionate size of the type-page to that of the leaf, as Pollard showed occurred in the work of the Venetian presses, is also discernible in the two books we have had under consideration. In almost all books, save for the ninth-century manuscript and Koberger's early works, the height of the type-page is approximately equal to the width of the page itself. Again, and this holds good for every example cited, the outer and lower margins are always larger than the other two. It is particularly interesting, to me at least, to note that the marginal proportions of the Rome incunabulum are almost identical with those found in the Kelmscott books, being just one per cent greater for each margin. Apparently Silber and Morris saw eye to eye in the matter of margins if in nothing else, since the former was one of the most mediocre printers of his day and the latter one of the greatest of the nineteenth century. The Passau volume achieves a different balance, since the lower and outer margins would have been the same and the inner and upper practically alike. A fair summary of the size of margins in early printed books would confine itself to these facts: the lower margin was usually between a fifth and a quarter the size of the total height of the page; the margins at the foot and the side of the page formed one pair and those at the top and in the gutter another; each member of one pair bore to the other member of that pair a proportion closely parallel to that found between the members of the second pair, while the greatest pro-

portionate increase is that found between the two pairs themselves. Beyond these general estimates, it would, I believe, be hazardous to venture very far. It is remarkable evidence of the astuteness of the greatest bibliographer of all, Alfred W. Pollard, that his figures, based on books that had been bound, find full confirmation from these sheets which have never known the trimming-knife.

The question that naturally follows this examination of the page proportions in early printed books is whether or not these figures can have any practical application. To this the answer must be a hesitant "yes" though they may have a greater value for one whose mathematical training is less rudimentary than mine. We may take one simple example. Let us assume that a unique copy of a book is preserved with the upper, outer and lower edges trimmed close to the text. The type-page measures 136x90mm. and the inner margin is 17mm.; from such figures it may be possible to arrive at the original size of the book as it came from the press. The average usual size of the type-page may be estimated at 68% x45% of the total height of the paper; consequently the original book may have been 200mm. tall. This is confirmed by the size of the inner margin, 17mm. (or 8½%) being a good average figure. Again, the height of the type-page was approximately equal to the breadth of the paper so that the paper was probably at least 136mm. wide in its first state. We may estimate the lower margin at 44mm., a bit more than one-fifth of the total height. The approximate original dimensions of the book would thus have been:

Page	*Type-page*	*Lower*	*Upper*	*Outer*	*Inner*
200x140 mm.	136x90 mm.	44 mm.	20 mm.	33 mm.	17 mm.
100% x70%	68% x45%	22%	10%	16½%	8½%

The importance of the measurement of the inner margin must not be overlooked in such a book, for, taken together with the type-page, it alone can show whether the book had normal or ex-

ceptionally large margins. If in this case the inner margin had measured 30mm. (or much more than 10% of the assumed height of the paper), one would have to conclude that all the margins were proportionately greater and that the type-page represented a much smaller percentage than 68% x 45% of the height; in short, a book with exceptionally large margins. For such a book, our figures would be of no avail.

From these averages it may also be possible to determine whether or not a certain copy, now much trimmed, could at an earlier date have been encased in a particular binding or formed part of some miscellaneous collection. If the proportions prove that the book was never sufficiently large to have fitted comfortably into the binding, we may be reasonably certain that it was never bound in it; if it could have been larger, of course, one could make no such deduction. The same theory may be applied to a book now contained in a binding rather too large for it; if the proportions indicate that it was always a good deal smaller than the binding, we may be quite sure that the book was "placed" in it. There are, no doubt, other uses to which these percentages could be applied.

I trust that these figures may not only be of some interest to the student of fine printing but also of use to the bibliographer in general. It is my fervent hope that I have not erred in my mathematical computations, a subject which at best I approach with fear and trepidation.

Author's Copyright in England before 1640*

By Leo Kirschbaum

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries there was no such legal entity as author's copyright. And we can see why this was so if, instead of looking back from the present, we go back to ancient times and the Middle Ages and look forward to the invention of printing. Neither in Rome nor in medieval England did an author have any recognized rights in his work. It could be copied and recopied without his permission. And the scribe was often not even interested in setting down the author's name—if he knew it.[1] In Shakespeare's day, neither the Stationers' Company nor the government was interested in the rights of the author. "He, of course, made his bargain with a printer, and if he parted with his manuscript for a price he surrendered all further rights in it. Government was concerned only with the control of the printing trade, not with the rewards of authorship."[2]

* This paper was written while the author was the Elizabeth Clay Howald Scholar for 1944-1945 at Ohio State University.

"The history of author's rights in England seems never to have been completely worked out. Most of the legal historians concern themselves little, if at all, with the position of affairs before the first Act establishing a limited copyright in the modern sense in 1710," on p. 143 of R. B. McKerrow, *An Introduction to Bibliography* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1928).

[1] F. A. Mumby, *Publishing and Bookselling* (London, J. Cape, 1934), pp. 19, 41, *passim.*

[2] R. C. Bald, *Early Copyright Litigation and its Bibliographical Interest*, in: *Papers* of the Bibliographical Society of America (New York, 1942), XXXVI:86. See also Phoebe Sheavyn, *The Literary Profession in the Elizabethan Age* (Manchester University Press, 1909), pp. 76-77; Marjorie Plant, *The English Book Trade* (London, George Allen & Unwin, 1939), pp. 98-121; Max Förster, *Shakespeare and Shorthand*, in: *The Philological Quarterly* (Iowa City, 1937), XVI: 5-6.

It has not been until fairly recent times that the rights of authors have been legally recognized. Today, common law copyright or copyright before publication is incorporeal. "The right of an author in and to his unpublished manuscript is full and complete. It is his absolute property and is subject to his disposal, either by assigning a qualified interest therein, or by making an absolute conveyance of his whole interest . . . ." After publication, the author's rights are protected by statute law.[3] But in Shakespeare's time the sole control the author had over his manuscript was physical ownership. He did not sell the right to print to the stationer; he sold the manuscript. Once the manuscript was sold, all his rights in the work ceased; and the stationer proceeded to establish stationer's copyright. If the manuscript came into possession of the stationer without purchase from the author, the latter had no legal claims for payment for the first or succeeding editions, or for any kind of redress.

The copyright that the so-called Stationers' Registers deal with is stationer's copyright. This was created according to the regulations and practices of the Stationers' Company, was recognized by the guild, and by the city and state as well. However, there was also a special kind of copyright which came into being by royal grant. Royal grant, or privilege, or monopoly, or patent, or copyright was a right conferred on certain stationers and non-stationers to be the sole printers of certain lucrative or specialized books. Graham Pollard suggests that such grants or privileges to stationers came into being because the early stationers frequently pirated each other's copies.[4]

No complete list[5] of Elizabeth and James' printing patents is

[3] H. G. Ball, *The Law of Copyright and Literary Property* (Albany, M. Bender, 1944), pp. 40, 471-474.

[4] *The Company of Stationers before 1557*, in: *The Library, A Quarterly Review of Bibliography* (London, The Bibliographical Society, 1937-1938), 4th Series, XVIII: 27-28.

[5] Partial lists are in: Vol. II, pp. 15-16 of London. Stationers' Company. *Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640*, edited

available. I cite a few. In 1559 Tottel was granted a lifetime privilege to print law books.[6] In the same year William Seres was granted a lifetime privilege to print primers. In 1571 this was renewed with the like right granted to his son. About 1579 this patent was assigned by the elder Seres to H. Denham, who associated with himself seven other young stationers and paid an annual rent first to the elder Seres and then to his son.[6] In 1573 Francis Flower (non-stationer) was given a lifetime right to be Queen's printer in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. This monopoly in schoolbook Latin grammars was assigned in 1574 to six stationers in partnership, who paid Flower one hundred pounds a year.[6] In 1575 Thomas Tallis and William Byrd (non-stationers) were given the right to print music for twenty-one years.[6] In 1577 John Day and his son Richard (and their assigns) were granted the lifetime right to print the *A.B.C. with the Little Catechism.* In 1582 the elder Day had seven or eight stationers as assigns; in 1584 Richard had five; by 1586 there were eighteen or more.[7] In 1588 Richard Watkins and John Roberts were given the privilege of printing all almanacs and prognostications.[8] In 1598 Thomas Morley was granted the patent for music printing.[9]

A great deal of trouble arose over certain of these printing monopolies. The sole ownership of the right to print Latin school grammars, A.B.C.'s, and primers was extremely valuable. Hence

by Edward Arber. (London, Privately Printed, 1875-1877; Birmingham, 1894), 5 Volumes. Hereafter this is cited: Arber, *Transcript*; T. E. Scrutton, *The Laws of Copyright* (London, J. Murray, 1883), pp. 293-300.

[6] Arber, *Transcript*, II:15.

[7] Arber, *Transcript*, II:775, 790-791; Cyril B. Judge, *Elizabethan Book-Pirates* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1934), pp. 13-14; H. Anders, *The Elizabethan ABC with the Catechism*, in: *The Library* (London, 1935-1936), 4th Series, XVI:32-48. Previous discussions of the Seres and Day privileges are largely superseded by the full accounts in T. W. Baldwin's *William Shakespere's Petty School* (Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1943). Day's privileges in the *ABC* and catechisms antedate Elizabeth. Under her he had a grant in 1559 for seven years and in 1567 for ten years (*ibid*, pp. 55-58, 68-69, *passim*).

[8] Arber, *Transcript*, II:16.

[9] Bruce Pattison, *Notes on Early Music Printing*, in: *The Library* (London, 1938-1939), 4th Series, XIX:412-414.

stationers who did not enjoy any of the fruits of these monopolies constantly pirated the forbidden books.[10] (This was true piracy—and should by no means be confused with what *we* call piracy or surreptitious publication, i.e., publication without the author's consent.) Non-stationers who owned privileges could sell the right to print to stationers, or to non-stationers, or could print themselves. Examples of the first are to be seen in the frequently met with imprint, reading: "Printed by A.B., the assign of C.D." An example of the second is Rosseter's *A book of ayres* (1601), which was sold at the composer's house but whose imprint tells us that it was printed "by the assent of T. Morley." Examples of the third are books which Morley printed at his own press.[11]

T. E. Scrutton has pointed out that such royal grants fall into four classes. "Some of them relate to works in which there would be no copyright at the present [e.g., playing cards[8]]; some involve the notion of licensing [e.g., Bibles and prayerbooks[12]]; some border on monopolies to inventions [e.g., the grant to Timothy Bright in 1589 to print for fifteen years all works in shorthand[8]]; and very few afford simple instances of copyright as it is now, created by direct royal grant."[13] It is in this last class that we are interested. Such privileges tend to approach the modern conception of an author's legal rights in his work. But there were not many.

In 1563 Thomas Cooper was granted for twelve years the exclusive privilege of printing an English dictionary which he had

[10] The best account is in Judge's *Elizabethan Book-Pirates* (Cambridge, 1934). See also Arber, *Transcript*, I:111-116, 144; II:751-806. On October 29, 1603 (Arber, *Transcript*, III:42-44), King James gave the Stationers' Company itself the sole right to print primers, psalters, almanacs, and prognostications. On March 8, 1616 (Arber, *Transcript*, III:679-682), he renewed the grant.

[11] Bruce Pattison, *op. cit.*, p. 413.

[12] Arber, *Transcript*, II:15-16; Scrutton, *op. cit.*, pp. 293-299. There is much material on such patents in W. W. Greg, *Books and Bookmen in the Correspondence of Archbishop Parker*, in: *The Library* (London, 1935-1936), 4th Series, XVI:243-279.

[13] Scrutton, *op. cit.*, p. 293.

augmented and corrected.[14] On July 25, 1605, James I ordered the Archbishop of Canterbury and the attorney-general to draw up a grant giving Arthur Golding the sole right to print such of his works as they considered to be beneficial to the church and commonwealth; but Golding died before the command was executed.[15] In 1611 Minsheu was granted the sole printing of his *Guide into Tongues*.[16] In 1617, Fynes Morison was granted the exclusive right to print his *Itinerary* for twenty-one years. He was also granted the right to obtain fines and seize copies, and the Stationers' Company was called on to assist him.[17]

In 1618 Samuel Daniel was given the exclusive right to print for ten years his *History of England*.[18] The book came out soon

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 293. Sir Thomas Elyot's Latin-English dictionary appeared in 1538, printed by Berthelet. It is entry No. 7659 in: *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland & Ireland . . . 1475-1640*, compiled by A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave (London, The Bibliographical Society, 1926), which is cited hereafter as *STC*. Another edition from the same press appeared in 1545 (*STC* 7660). In 1548 Berthelet printed an edition augmented by Cooper (*STC* 7661). "The second tyme enriched, by T. Cooper" came out in 1552 (*STC* 7662); "The third tyme corrected," in 1559 (*STC* 7663). These last two editions were also printed by Berthelet. The University of Michigan copy of the 1559 edition has "Cum priuilegio" on the title-page. For 1562-1563 (Arber, *Transcript*, I:199), apparently near July of the former year, there is the following entry in the Stationers' Register: "Recevyd of Rycharde haryson for his lycense for pryntinge of a boke intituled the Dyxionary of master Thomas Elyott and master Cowper. viij s." It looks, therefore, as though Cooper's royal grant in 1563 was to keep Harison from establishing copyright in the Eliot-Cooper dictionary. In 1565 appeared Cooper's "Thesaurus linguae Romanae & Britannicae. fol. In aed. quondam Bertheleti, per H. Wykes, 1565" (*STC* 5686). According to *The Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee. (London, Smith, Elder, 1885-1901) XII:149; hereafter cited *DNB*: "This book, commonly known as 'Cooper's Dictionary,' delighted Queen Elizabeth so much that she expressed her determination to promote the author as far as lay in her power." Cooper's *Dictionary*, together with all other dictionaries in folio, was entered to Newbery and Denham "by ye queenes maiesties graunte" on December 30, 1584 (Arber, *Transcript*, II:438). From the author's and the stationers' viewpoint, the Eliot-Cooper dictionary and Cooper's successor to it were undoubtedly regarded as the same copyright.

[15] Louis T. Golding, *An Elizabethan Puritan: Arthur Golding* (New York, Richard R. Smith, 1937), pp. 124-125.

[16] Scrutton, *op. cit.*, p. 299. *STC* 17944-7. Minsheu's great lexicon is "in all probability the first English book printed by subscription, or at all events the first which contains a list of the subscribers." (*DNB*, XXXVIII:48.)

[17] Scrutton, *op. cit.*, p. 295. *STC* 18205.

[18] Scrutton, *op. cit.*, p. 295.

afterwards: *The Collection of the Historie of England.* By S. D. (London, Printed by Nicholas Okes, dwelling in Fosterlane for the Author. Cum Priuilegio). It contained the following warning:

A Speciall Priuiledge, Licence and Authority, is granted by the Kings Maiesties Letters Patents, vnto the Author *Samuel Daniel*, one of the Groomes of the Queenes Maiesties most Honorable Priuy Chamber, for him, his Executors, Administrators, Assignes or Deputies, to Print, or cause to bee Imprinted, and to sell assigne and dispose, to his, or their benefit, This Booke, intituled, *The Collection of the History of England.* Streightly forbidding any other to Imprint or cause to be Imprinted, to Import, vtter or sell, or cause to be Imported, vttered, or sold the sayd Booke or Bookes, or any part thereof, within any of his Majestyes Dominions, vpon payne of his Majesties high displeasure, and to forfeit Fiue pounds Lawfull *English* Mony for euery such Booke or Bookes, or any part thereof, printed Imported, vttered, or sold, contrary to the meaning of this Priuiledge, besides the Forfeiture of the sayd Booke, Bookes, &c. as more at large appeareth by his Maiesties sayd Letters Patents, dated at *Westminster*, the 11. of March, in the 15 yeare of his Reigne of *England* and of *Scotland* the one and fiftieth.[19]

In 1623 George Wither was given a fifty-one years' patent for his *Hymns and Songs of the Church:* A copy was to be inserted in every psalm book "in meeter" (of which the Stationers' Company owned the patent). The author was given the right of seizing any psalters without the *Hymns* in stationers' printing-houses, bookshops, homes. And Wither was to receive as much for each sheet as the guild was paid for a sheet of its psalter. Wither's patent provoked a bitter fight between him and the guild. He blasted the Company and its members in *The Schollers Purgatory, Discouered in the Stationers Common-wealth* [1625].[20] In some respects, Wither's book represents the first extended demand for author's rights in English history.

In 1635 Francis Holyoke was given a grant to print and sell a dictionary compiled by him; there were provisions in the patent

[19] Samuel Daniel, *The Complete Works in Verse and Prose*, edited by Alexander B. Grosart. [London, Hazell, Watson & Viney, Ltd., 1885-1896], IV:72.

[20] Scrutton, *op. cit.*, p. 295; Arber, *Transcript*, IV:13-20. *STC* 25908, "for G. W.," 1623; *STC* 25909-10a, "assignes of G. Wither." *The Schollers Purgatory* was reprinted in the *First Collection* of the Spenser Society ([Manchester, England, Printed for The Society by Charles Simms and Company] 1872), Number 12.

for seizure of piratical imitations.[21] In 1635 George Sandys was granted the right to print and sell his paraphrase of the psalms for fourteen years.[22]

An author could even get a royal grant for the sole printing of his book *after* a stationer had already established copyright by entrance. George Sandys' translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* was entered to M. Lownes and Barrett on April 27, 1621 (Arber, *Transcript*, IV: 53). Barrett's widow assigned her interest to Parker on April 3, 1626 (Arber, *Transcript*, IV:158). And T. Lownes was confirmed in his dead father's right on April 10, 1627 (Arber, *Transcript*, IV:176). On April 24, 1626 Sandys was granted a royal privilege to print his translation of Ovid for twenty-one years.[23] On May 7, 1626 (Arber, *Transcript*, IV:160) Stansby entered the book in the Stationers' Register. He published it the same year, "Imprinted at London MDCXXVI Cum Privilegio." On May 30, 1627 (Arber, *Transcript*, IV:180-181), T. Lownes assigned to H. Lownes and R. Young most of his father's copies recorded in the April 10, 1627 entrance (see above)—but not Sandys' Ovid. Either there was an unrecorded assignment to Young, or the latter assumed that he had got this copy from T. Lownes along with the rest. At any rate, in 1628 Young reprinted the 1626 edition: "London Printed by Robert Young and are to be sold by J. Grismond. 1628." Sandys proceeded to take action to protect his privilege, as is evidenced by the minutes of the stationers' court on two occasions. We read for April 8, 1628:

> This day Mr Sandes Patent for the sole printing of the 15. bookes of Ovides Metamorphosis by him translated into English verse was openlye reade in the hall this quarter day. And it is ordered that th' entrance to Mr Barrett and Mr. Lownes deceased of the first five bookes and the assignmt to Robt Younge, And the Entrance of the whole 15. bookes to Mr Stansby shalbe all Crost out of the Regester Booke of the Company for that noe man shall laye anie claime to the printinge of the same or any parte thereof.[24]

[21] Scrutton, *op. cit.*, p. 296. *STC* 13620-1.

[22] Scrutton, *op. cit.*, p. 296. *STC* 21724.

[23] Scrutton, *op. cit.*, p. 296.

[24] London. Stationers' Company. Court Book C. (Unpublished MS), folio 99a;

Apparently Young continued to print and sell his edition for on January 26, 1631 we read:

This day upon a new Complaint made by mr Sandes about the printing of his translacon of the xv. bookes of (Ovides Metamorphosis.) The mr Wardens & Assistants hearing what mr Sandes could alleadge and what mr Young & mr Haviland could say in Answere. They then for their further satisfaction caused all the Entries heretofore made & an order concerning these Entries to be read wch order followeth in these words (vide page 99 per Sandes) as therein appeareth wch order being Read this Cort conceived to be donn upon very good ground & doe approve of the same in all pointes And upon further examinacon of this Cause doe find that the said Robert Young & John Haviland (at the tyme of their imprinting the said bookes) did know that mr Sandes had before obteyned his Maiesties lettres Pattentes for the Sole printing of his said Translacon And that they printed the bookes now in question by a Copy printed wth this addicon (cum priviledgio) wch induceth the Cort to conceive that they could not be ignorant that the sole printing of the same bookes belonged to the said mr Sandes. whereupon the Cort agayne ordered that the printing of the said booke is to remayne soly in the disposicon of the said mr Sandes & his assignes.[25]

In the register, the Barrett and Lownes entrance of 1621 and the Stansby entrance of 1626 are crossed out. Hence the copyright established in 1621 by entrance was abrogated by Sandys' patent of 1626. But what is perhaps most interesting is Stansby's entrance. I think it indicates that to an early seventeenth-century stationer, copyright could only be conceived of in terms of stationers' right.

Rights to sole printing could also be conferred on the author's kin after his decease. Arthur Golding was buried on May 13, 1606. On May 15, 1606, a seven-year royal patent for the sole printing and sole sale of Arthur Golding's works was granted to his son Percival in conjunction with Thomas Wilson and to their assigns (L. T. Golding, *An Elizabethan Puritan: Arthur Golding*

quoted by W. W. Greg, in: *Review of English Studies* (London, Sidgwick & Jackson, 1928), IV:95 and in: R. B. Davis, *Early Editions of George Sandys's 'Ovid': The Circumstances of Production*, in: *Papers* of the Bibliographical Society of America (New York, 1941), XXXV:270.

[25] London. Stationers' Company. Court Book C. (Unpublished MS), folio 117b; quoted in Davis, *op. cit.*, pp. 270-271. Some Elizabethan contractions here and elsewhere in this paper have been silently expanded.

[New York, 1937], pp. 137-139). In 1630 Dr. Willett's son was given a grant to print his father's *Synopsis Papismi* for twenty-one years: the stationer who owned the copyright was unable or unwilling to reprint the book.[26] Dr. Fulkes' daughter, Mistress Ogden, obtained in 1618 a grant to print her late father's so-called *Confutation of the Rheimish testament*, even though the copyright was owned at the time by the stationers, John Bill and Bonham Norton. The latter tried to have the grant rescinded.[27]

An author could get a patent which enabled him to select his own printer. In 1618 Thomas Middleton, the dramatist, was granted the right to choose William Alley as the sole printer of his tract, *The Peacemaker or Great Britain's Blessing*.[28] It appeared the next year with "cum privilegio" on its title-page. Bald believes (I think rightly) that Middleton got the patent for financial reasons. Perhaps he was paid royalties.

Such royal grants to authors are the exceptions that prove the rule. Copyright—the right to publish and exclusively enjoy the profit from the printed book—was bestowed normally only by the Stationers' Company and solely on its members. This is brought out in a decision of the stationers' court on January 19, 1598:

> Against printinge for forens to the Company. fforasmuche as diu'se abuses, of late tyme haue ben Comitted, by sundry persons of this Companye in procuringe of Copies and Bookes to be entred and alowed vnto them and then pryntinge the same for suche persons as be not of this Companye ffor Remedie thereof, yt is ordered that if any person or persons of this Company shall hereafter print or cause to be printed any copie or booke wche shall not be proper to hym self and whereof he shall not reape the whole Benefit to [*him self*] his own vse by sellinge it in the Companye but shall suffer any other person or persons that shall not be of this companye to haue the benefit of the sale or disposition thereof. Then in eu'y suche case all and euery suche bookes and copies shall and may be disposed & printed againe accordinge to the discretion of the mr. wardens, and Assistentes of this Companye for the tyme beinge or the moore parte of them And the partie

[26] Scrutton, *op. cit.*, p. 296. *STC* 25696-25700a.

[27] Scrutton, *op. cit.*, pp. 295, 300; Arber, *Transcript*, III: 39.

[28] Scrutton, *op. cit.*, p. 300; R. C. Bald, *Early Copyright Litigation and its Bibliographical Interest*, in: *Papers* of the Bibliographical Society of America (New York, 1942), XXXVI: 83.

or parties offendinge herein shall ipso facto Lose & forfait all his and their Right & interest in all & eu'y suche booke & bookes.[29]

Where there is smoke there must be fire. And indeed, outside of royal grants of copyright to authors, we do find a few examples in our period of authors or their assigns (non-stationers) having books printed for themselves and selling them themselves. In other words, by agreement between author (or assign) and printer, something similar to present-day author's copyright came into being. But the copy was always entered to the printer. The guild continued to recognize only the stationers' rights. And frequently the stationers' copyright superseded the abnormal agreement between author (or assign) and stationer. But before we examine the evidence, it will be wise to make certain distinctions—which some scholars have overlooked.

One must not misinterpret those few entrances in the registers in which it is stated in the margin that the copy was given back to the author. This does not mean that the author controlled the publication but that the stationer, not willing to publish the book for one reason or another, returned the manuscript to the author, who, if he chose, could try to find a new publisher; or that the stationer's widow returned the unpublished work to the author. On August 10, 1632 (Arber, *Transcript*, IV: 282) John Waterson entered Reynold's *Mithomystes*; the entry is crossed out and we read in the margin "crost out by his owne consent and resigned to the Author vt patet supra &c."—the book was later published by Seile. On April 14, 1634 (Arber, *Transcript*, IV: 317), Allot entered a treatise on the Lord's Supper by Obadiah Sedgwick which had been "Licensed the 28th. of July 1633"; in the margin we read, "Surrendered vp into the authors hands againe"—according to the *Short-Title Catalogue* the book was never printed. On April 18, 1633 (Arber, *Transcript*, IV: 295) William Jones entered *The Art of Stenography* by Theodore Medcalfe; in the margin we read

[29] London. Stationers' Company. *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company 1576 to 1602—from Register B*; edited by W. W. Greg and E. Boswell (London, The Bibliographical Society, 1930), p. 59.

"This copy by consent of Mistris Jones is Surrendered vp to the Authour to be by him dosposed [*sic*] of." Similarly, Blount entered a copy on January 17, 1632 (Arber, *Transcript*, IV:270); according to the margin, "This by Consent of Mistris Blount is surrendered into the Authors hands as apeareth by her Note. dated the 20th of July 1633." The same book, a history of the Turks by Grimeston, was entered by Stansby on September 3, 1633 (Arber, *Transcript*, IV:304).

Professor M. A. Shaaber has recently paid attention to the class of books published for the author in Shakespeare's time. He prefaces his list of fifteen books with this statement:

> In all probability it did not often happen that an author preferred to publish a book himself instead of striking the best bargain he could with a stationer. Most of the examples which I have noticed are books of a somewhat limited interest—mathematical textbooks, picture books, and the like. But they allow one to assume that it was possible for an author to have his book printed and to retain some of the rights usually vested in the publisher, including that of selling the book himself and of controlling further editions. In books of this kind the imprint usually states that the book is printed for the author and is to be sold at his house or that it is printed by his assignment, which presumably means that he retains some control over the copyright . . . . But when such a book is entered in the registers, it is almost always entered by the printer, presumably in order to protect his rights and the author's against acquisitive members of the Company. If the imprint states that the book was printed by A. B. for the author, one is entitled to suppose, since it is uncertain whether the privilege of entry was open to non-members of the Company, that the imprint gives the more complete account of the publishing arrangements and that the author probably hired the printer to produce the book for him, often sold copies himself, and almost certainly retained some control over the republication of his book. But if the printer enters the book on behalf of the author to protect it against other members of the trade and if the imprint states merely that he printed the book, one has no means of even suspecting the author's exceptionally active role in the publication of his book, and the corresponding shortcomings of the evidence of the registers, unless by chance additional data from other sources are available. The fact that two clear cut examples [see Quarles *Emblems* and Dowland's book below] of just such a state of affairs have recently been brought to light suggests that there may have been yet others.[80]

[80] M. A. Shaaber, *The Meaning of the Imprint in Early Printed Books*, in: *The Library* (London, 1943-1944), 4th Series, XXIV: 137-138. The list is in a footnote

It will be wise to examine Shaaber's list carefully before we base any generalizations on it. Under *a* I put what he gives us about the book; under *b* I offer my own comment. The volume and page, given in parentheses, refers to Arber, *Transcript.*[5]

I (a) *STC* 1312, Bales, *The writinge schoole-master,* 1590, 'sold at the Authors.' (b) This was entered to Thomas Orwin on December 1, 1589 (II:535). The entrance has extraordinary precautions: the book is entered under the hands of both the wardens and Master Hartwell; if it belongs to another, the entrance is to be void; it is allowed by the Archbishop of Canterbury "with master Hartwelles hand to yt;" and in the margin, "this is allowed by the co[n]sent of the whole table [i.e., the court]. as it is here sett downe." I suspect that the cause of all this was the patent to Timothy Bright on July 26 of the same year to be sole printer of all works in shorthand (II:16). *STC* merely gives the imprint as "T. Orwin." Perhaps, the stationer's fear of selling a book that might be regarded as the infringement of a privilege accounts for the book's being sold by the author. But, of course, the book was a very specialized one, too.

II (a) *STC* 5737, Anthony Copley, *A fig for fortune,* 1596, 'Printed . . . for C.A.,' possibly the author. (b) *STC* gives the imprint, "R. Johnes f. C.A., 1596." The book was entered to Jones on January 23, 1596 (III:57). There does not appear to be a bookseller to fit the initials "C.A.," and Shaaber may be right in suggesting that they are the author's.

III (a) *STC* 11399, Sleidan, *An epitome of Frossard,* 1608, 'Printed . . . for Per. Golding,' the translator. (b) *STC* 11399 gives: "An epitome of Frossard, compiled by J. Sleydane, Tr. P. Golding. T. Purfoot f. P. Golding, 1608." *STC* 11400 is another issue, "T. Purfoot, 1611." This is a case of royal grant to the author for sole printing. The book had been entered as far back as May 3, 1580 (II:370); but apparently had never been

---

on p. 138. Entry was never open to non-members of the Stationers' Company, except to a few drapers before 1590 who practiced the stationers' trade. It was never open to authors.

printed. Actually, as we could guess from the date of the above entrance, and as we can definitely tell from the handwriting of the manuscript which has survived (*An Elizabethan Puritan*, p. 144), the real translator was not Percival Golding but his father Arthur Golding. Percival could claim royal copyright even after affixing his own name, for when he was given a seven-year patent in 1606 for his father's works (*supra*), he was also given a seven-year patent for his own works. (The issue with the variant imprint bearing only Purfoot's name backs up in one respect Shaaber's warning above: even though no non-stationer's name appears in a surviving imprint there may still be a possibility that we are dealing with a privilege outside the Stationers' Company. I suggest, by the way, that the issue with Purfoot's name represents his payment for the printing costs.)

IV(a) *STC* 15078a, Comenius, *Porta linguarum*, 1631; one issue 'Printed . . . for the author.' (b) The book was entered by Sparkes and Slater on July 28, 1631 (IV:258). The imprints of the two issues of the first edition (*STC* 15078, 15078a) read: "G. Millerus, sumpt. M. Sparkes & T. Slater, 1631" and "G. Miller f. the author." The next three editions (*STC* 15079-81) were for Sparkes.

V (a) *STC* 15459, le Moyne, *La clef des champs*, 1586, a picture book entered by and printed for the 'author,' a French engraver. (b) This was entered on July 31, 1587 (II:474). It is to be doubted that the clerk considered this an entrance to an author. This was an entrance to an allied craftsman. Some members of the Drapers' Company were allowed to enter books during this period. LeMoyne may even have been forced to register the book, for the entrance was made a year after it was published.

VI (a) *STC* 16674, Lodge, *Scillaes metamorphosis*, 1589; possibly the joining of Lodge's name with that of Richard Jones, the printer, in the register (II:530) means that Lodge reserved certain rights. (b) The book was issued in 1589 for R. Jhones. And it was entered to Ric Jones on September 22, 1589 (II:530). Ar-

ber's page shows that Lodge was not a co-enterer. His name was apparently written in the margin afterwards.

VII (a) *STC* 17203, *Gerileon of Englande*, assigned to and printed for the translator, who may have been a stationer. (b) The book was printed in 1578 for M. Jennynges, the translator. It had been entered by John Jugge on May 20, 1577 (II:312). It was assigned to Miles Jennynges on April 6, 1579 (II:351). On the same day, he was assigned another book from Maunsell, and he also entered a book himself. In 1581 Jennynges published *A Booke of Military Discipline. A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers, 1557-1640* considers him a stationer.

VIII (a) *STC* 20939, Reynolds, *Mythomystes*, 1632, entered to John Waterson, a bookseller,'crost out... and resigned to the Author' (IV:282). (b) The entrance was on August 10, 1632 (IV: 282). The book was printed for H. Seile. All that the marginal notation means is that Waterson returned the manuscript to the author.

IX (a) *STC* 21332, Rosseter, *A book of ayres*, 1601, 'are to be solde at his [Rosseter's] house.' (b) The book was printed under the music patent, as is attested by the imprint given in *STC*, "P. Short by the assent of T. Morley." It was entered to Short on May 8, 1601 (III:184).

X (a) *STC* 23061, Speidell, *A geometricall extraction*, 1616, 'are to be solde at the Author's house.' (b) The book was entered to Allde on January 15, 1616 (III:581). *STC* gives "E. Allde, 1616" for the imprint.

XI *STC* 23063, Speidell, *New logarithmes*, 1619, 'are to bee solde at his [Speidell's] dwelling house.'

XII (a) *STC* 23784, Taylor, *The pennyles pilgrimage*, 1618, 'Printed... at the charges of the Author,' entered by Henry Gosson, who published many of Taylor's books. (b) The book was entered by Gosson on November 2, 1618 (III:635).

XIII (a) *STC* 24481, Ubaldini, *A Discourse concerninge the Spanishe fleete*, 1590, entered by John Wolf, who was not the

printer, sold at the shop of Augustin Ryther, who engraved the plates. (b) It was entered to Wolf on October 13, 1590 (II:564) "by booke and otherwise. in all languages." *STC* 24481's imprint has "A. Hatfield, 1590." *STC* 24481a is the entry for the plates to the above issued separately.

XIV (a) *STC* 25337, Whetstone, *An heptameron of ciuill discourses,* 1582, apparently entered by Jones, the printer, and Whetstone, though it may be that the latter's name appears in the margin of the entry because it was omitted in the body. (b) The same explanation as in VI applies. The author's name is not a part of the entry to R. Jones on January 11, 1582 (II:404) but an addition in the margin.

XV (a) *STC* 25908, Wither, *The hymnes and songs of the Church,* 'Printed for G. W. 1623, Cum Priuilegio Regis Regali.' (b) This is a case of royal grant to the author for sole printing.

When analyzed, Shaaber's tentative list of books in which the author may have had some say in publication is not impressive. III, IX, and XV go out because they have to do with royal grants. VI, XIV, and VIII go out as not applicable. II is dubious. VII represents the author as stationer. V and XIII represent the author as engraver, a member of a craft allied to printing. This leaves five examples of books sold by or printed for the author. X and XI are technical books. I is a shorthand book, sold at the house of the author, who was a professional writing-master and teacher. IV and XII are more-or-less typical bookshop items. Stationer's copyright in both is indicated by entrance. Furthermore, it should be particularly noted that the author's name in IV does not appear in any edition but only in an issue. As I suggest elsewhere in this paper,[31] this may mean that the stationer remunerated the author by giving the latter copies to present with the expectation of monetary thanks or to sell. That the stationer owned copyright in IV is indicated by the other issue and by succeeding editions. Thus, the Shaaber list hardly supplies us with

[31] See footnote 35.

evidence that any kind of author's copyright (outside of royal grant) was common.

The *Pforzheimer Catalogue*[32] also contains a listing that must be investigated to determine how extensive ownership of copyright was outside the Stationers' Company. Its "Index of Bibliographica" groups under "Private Publication" twenty-four books described in the *Catalogue*. My procedure here will be the same as with the Shaaber list. Under *a* I put what the *Pforzheimer Catalogue* says about the item in question; under *b* I give my own comments. In order not to repeat I sometimes omit the *Catalogue's* notation of entrance in the Stationers' Register. The initial numbers given are the *Catalogue's*. In this section, too, the volume and page when enclosed in parentheses with no other notation refers to Arber's *Transcript*.[5] It seems best to deal with all the items listed under "Private Publication" even though some of them are outside my date limits.

Appendix 9. (a) *A Pil To purge Melancholie*. This railing pamphlet of eight leaves may have "some relationship to Nashe and his coterie." The printer was William White. Only one copy is extant. "Its rarity may perhaps be due to the circumstance that it was privately printed, as indicated by the omission of imprint, and that very few copies were ever issued." (b) There is no evidence one way or the other that this was "privately printed." If the work came out after the bishops' edict for the burning of satirical books by Nashe, Harvey, and others (June 1, 1599), the absence of information as to printer or publisher is understandable. The stationers involved would certainly want to stay out of trouble.

No. 58. (a) *STC* 1902. [Sir William Berkeley]. *The Lost Lady*, "Jo. Okes, for John Colby . . . 1638." There are two issues with this imprint: one 1638, the other 1639. "The Britwell-Folger copy belongs to an unrecorded first issue, possibly struck off for the author as in it the imprint reads: 'Imprinted at Lon-

[32] *The Carl H. Pforzheimer Library: English Literature 1475-1700*, compiled by W. A. Jackson and Emma Va. Unger (New York, 1940). 3 Volumes.

don. Anno MDCXXXVIIj' . . . ." The title-page for the second issue (1638) was entirely reset. (b) The Pforzheimer copy is not a second issue of the first edition but a first issue of the second edition. See R. C. Bald, *Sir William Berkeley's The Lost Lady*, in: *The Library*, (London, 1936-1937), 4th Series, XVII:402: "Up to the end of page 40 this [the arabic numeral edition] is a page-for-page reprint of the first edition [the roman numeral edition]. From page 41 onwards this edition begins to add an extra line to the page . . . ." Bald thinks the first edition (printed by Okes) was unauthorized by Berkeley and was suppressed by him. The Folger copy contains MS corrections by Berkeley's scribe. Whether or not the first edition was struck off for Berkeley or was unauthorized by him, the Stationers' Register shows that copyright reposed in the hands of the stationers. The play was entered to Okes on March 5, 1638 (Arber, *Transcript*, IV:410) and was assigned by him to Colby on September 24 following (IV:438).

No. 139. (a) *Plays, Never before Printed. Written By . . . The Duchess of Newcastle. London, Printed by A. Maxwell, in the Year M. DC. LX. VIII.* ". . . Judging from the imprint this volume was brought out at the expense of the noble authoress."(b) Whenever an imprint lacks the name of a publisher, the *Pforzheimer Catalogue* assumes private publication. But such an hypothesis is unwarranted on the basis of such evidence. When the printer was the publisher as well, it was customary for the imprint merely to have "Printed by" followed by the name of the stationer. On the other hand, Shaaber has pointed out that, when sale by many booksellers was expected, it was customary for the publishers to issue the book with an abbreviated imprint naming only the printer.[33]

No. 204. (a) . . . *Reliquae Gethinianae. Or Some Remains Of The Most Ingenious and Excellent Lady, Grace Lady Gethin . . . Published by Her nearest Relations to preserve her Memory . . . The Third Edition. With a Coppy of Verses Written by Mr. Congreve. Unto which is added*

[33] Shaaber, *op. cit.*, pp. 125-127.

A Funeral Sermon . . . London, Printed [*by David Edwards*] *for John Graves . . . 1703*. This is the third issue. "The earliest issue known has what appears to be a cancel title with the imprint: 'Printed by D. Edwards, for the Author. 1699'; and, though not mentioned on that title, Birch's *Sermon* was appended as in the present. The second issue has another cancel title which describes itself as 'The 2d Edition,' notes that Birch's *Sermon* is 'added,' and has the imprint 'Printed by D. Edwards in Fetter-Lane. 1700.' " (b) Although it is clear that the author's relatives paid for the publication, it also seems clear from the imprints in the second and third issues that a stationer or stationers owned the copyright. Payment of publication costs by the author or friends of the author does not necessarily mean ownership of copyright. Even though the non-stationer got all the copies printed, even though he may have sold them himself, copyright could still reside in the stationer's hands. Where else could it reside at a time when there was no recognized copyright outside crown grant and stationer's copyright? I discuss these matters more fully in connection with the next item, *Coryats Crudities*.

No. 218. (a) *STC* 5808. *Coryats Crudities*. Engraved title-page with no imprint; printed title-page: "London, Printed by W. S. Anno Domini 1611." The *Pforzheimer Catalogue* puts on the first in brackets: "London, by William Stansby for the author, 1611." "Although this book was entered by Edmund[34] Blount and William Barrett, 26 November 1610, there is reason to believe that they did not publish it for Ben Jonson states in his acrostic, recto (a2), that Coryate '. . . sets it out at his owne charge; And therein . . . Shewes he dares more than Paul's Church-yard durst do.', and Henry Parrot (*Lacquei ridiculosi* Epigram 144, line 6) sneered that 'Tom Coriat solde the Books he made himselfe.' which would seem to indicate that Coryate was forced to bring the book out at his own expense, and also would account for the absence from the title of any publisher's name." "Sixty-five years later Cotton

[34] *Sic*—for "Edward."

states in his *Compleat Angler* p. 20, '. . . I will sit down and write my Travels, and like *Tom Coriate* print them at my own charge.' " "It was probably his difficulties with the booksellers which induced Coryate to solicit the extraordinary sheaf of testimonials prefixed to the volume. Possibly he acted upon the notion apparently now current among publishers of social directories that every person listed is a prospective purchaser of the work." (b) It is quite probable that the stationers refused to follow the customary procedure: buy the MS outright, have it printed, and expect the returns from wholesale and retail sales to pay for the cost of production and to still leave a profit; that Coryate made some kind of deal with them in which he paid for the printing himself and was to get a certain number of the finished books, the private sale or presentation of which would reimburse him for the printing cost.[35] But that Coryate owned the copyright is not demonstrable. The absence of publishers' names in the imprint may merely mean, as we have seen, handling by many booksellers. The evidence of the Stationers' Register goes against the *Pforzheimer Catalogue* assumptions. Edward Blount and William Barrett entered the book on November 26, 1610 (III:449). Stationer's copyright in it was still viable in 1626 and 1638: in the former

[35] For stationers to pay authors for their copy either partially or wholly by giving them a certain number of the printed books which the authors themselves could sell or distribute for a gratuity was probably more common than extant evidence indicates. It may be that some of the imprints which read "for" the author or have no stationers' names in them have their explanation in this custom. At any rate, Richard Robinson, in his *Eupolemia*, a MS written apparently in 1602 (printed by G. M. Vogt, in: *Studies in Philology* (Chapel Hill, 1924), XXI:631-648) tells us a great deal about the practice. For *Robinsons Ruby* (1577) Charlewood the printer-publisher gave "mee for the Copy 26 books": his dedicatee gave him two crowns "And I made benefit of 25 bookes mo." (Robinson lists his takings under "Patrones & Benevolence.") For his *Gesta Romanorum* (1577) "besydes sale of 25 boks" appears after the dedication sum. For *The Dyall of Dayly Contemplacion* (1578), he received ten shillings for the dedication and "I made benefit of 25 mo bokes given mee every boke 10 sheets xij d." For a translation of Nicholas Hemming's (Niel Hemmingsen's) exposition upon the twenty-fifth Psalm (1580), besides the dedicatee's gift, "I made benefit of 25 books 10 sheetes a peece, xijd." And so on—. For his 1596 *A Fourthe proceeding in the Harmony of Kinge Davids Harp*, above the money which a virtuous Lady gave him for his dedication after Egerton had refused him, "I made benefit of 25 Bookes mo, amongst my other good Frendes in the City to some L s."

year Widow Barrett assigned her part to Parker (IV:157); and in the latter year, Parker assigned this part to Haviland and Wright(IV:433). I suggest, therefore, that Blount and Barrett *were* the publishers of the 1611 *Crudities.*

No. 234. (a) *A Proposition For the Advancement Of Experimental Philosophy. By A. Cowley. London, Printed by J. M. for Henry Herringman . . . 1661.* "Nethercot, despite the imprint, conjectured that copies with the present title were issued privately for circulation among the members of the then recently founded Royal Society; and that copies which have another title were for public sale. The other title reads: 'A Proposition For the Advancement of Learning. By A. Cowley . . . London, Printed by J. M. for Henry Herringman . . . 1661.' It is not unlikely that that was actually the case. For the 'Proposition for the advancement of learning' is the title under which this tract was entered in the Stationers' Register. That title was printed on the recto of Sig. [A] which in the present issue is cancelled and the quarter-sheet 'a' substituted. The fact that the quarter-sheet contains, besides the altered title, the dedicatory epistle to the Royal Society makes it seem more probable that these later issue copies were intended for presentation. However, against this view may be placed the imprint and the fact that this issue is more frequently found than the other, though neither is very common." (b) Theoretically, there is no reason why an individual or a group should not have bought all of an issue or an edition for presentation purposes. But this practice can hardly be considered "private publication." The *Pforzheimer Catalogue* is constantly ambiguous in its use of this phrase. That the second issue of Cowley's tract was purchased for presentation purposes is possible—but the evidence given seems slim. Herringman owned the copyright; he entered the discourse on February 13, 1661.[35a]

[35a] Volume II, p. 288, in: London. Stationers' Company. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers; from 1640-1708 A.D.* (London: Privately Printed, 1913-1914). 3 Volumes. Hereafter this will be cited as Eyre, *Transcript*, with the volume and page number.

No. 242. (a) *STC* 6247. *The First Part Of The Historie Of England. By Samuel Danyel. London, Printed for the Company of Stationers. 1613.* "This is a paginary reprint of the first edition, 1612, even to the extent that the note at the end stating that that edition was but a few copies for private distribution is repeated. At the end of the dedication of the 1609 edition of his *Ciuile Wares* Daniel mentioned that he proposed to write a prose history of England. Apparently, having completed three books, he had them privately printed by Nicholas Okes in 1612, in order that he might distribute copies among his friends for criticism before continuing his labours. Okes entered the title 20 April 1612, but Simon Waterson, Daniel's usual publisher and the executor of his will, obtained an order from the court of wardens, 27 June 1612, transferring to himself the copyright in the work. Six months later (2 January 1613) the following agreement was entered in the unpublished Court-Book C (30b):[24] 'Mr. Samuel Dañiell. Yt is agreed that he shall deliū into the hall 200 p[er]fect bookes. whereof 40 be in thands of Wydowe Crosley of Oxon which the Comp^{nie} shall receive of her as p[ar]cell of the said 200 books. And also that he shalbe presently paid for the said 200 books. xxl. Also he promiseth that yf he mend or add any thinge to the book hereafter that then yt shalbe, prynted accordinge to thorder of the Comp^{anie}.' Under that arrangement apparently the present edition was issued. However, it appears to be the only one so published for Daniel obtained a patent for this book, 11 March 1618, and the undated edition, the last published in his lifetime, was privately printed by right of that privilege. The subsequent editions (*STC* 6249 and 6250 are issues of the *same edition*; Waterson appears to have compensated Okes by having the later editions printed by him) were published by Waterson [and] presumably by virtue of his entry which later was transferred to his son John Waterson, 19 August 1635." The 1613 edition was printed by Humphrey Lownes, John Beale, and William Jaggard. (b) I think that Daniel's *History* is a more important item in the narra-

tive of early author's copyright in England than the *Pforzheimer Catalogue* indicates. In "Certaine Aduertisements to the Reader" of the first edition, Daniel reveals that he paid for its printing and intended to distribute the book privately: "This Peece of our History, which I heere divulge not, but impart priuately to such Worthy Persons as haue fauored my indeauors herein . . . [it would have been more] had my Health and Meanes beene answerable to my desire:" The documents employed he will issue separately "assoone as I haue meanes to Print" [Samuel Daniel,[19] *The Complete Works* (London, 1885-1896), IV:81-82]. In the "Errata" he writes: "after this priuate impression, which is but of a few coppies for my friends, I will amend what is amisse in the publique (*ibid*, V:294). The printer of this first edition, Nicholas Okes, entered the book under the hands of an official censor and the wardens on April 20, 1612 (III:481). Its imprint (*STC* 6246) reads, "Printed by Nicholas Okes dwelling neere Holborne bridge 1612." Okes' entrance was crossed out; in the margin we read: "put out by order of A Court 22 Junij 1612." On June 27, 1612 (III:489) we find this new entrance: "Master Waterson. Entred for his Copye vnder th'andes of master Doctor Mokett and Thwardens, and by the relacon of master Norton vnder his handwrytinge that my Lord grace [of Canterbury] his pleasure is soe, A booke called, The first parte of the History of England by Samuell Danyell. vjd." What happened seems clear. Daniel may have paid for the printing of an edition for himself; but, since author's copyright did not exist, Okes felt free to enter the book as his own future property. The only way in which Daniel could control the copyright was to get a friendly stationer (Waterson) to establish copyright indirectly for him. And it is noteworthy that it was not the Court of Assistants of the Stationers' Company which really made the decision. It was the viceroy of the Stationers' Company himself, the Archbishop of Canterbury, to whom Daniel had to appeal. And of course Norton,

who was master of the Company at the time, had to follow the Archibishop's command. (How eloquent of supra-legal authority are the words—"his pleasure is soe"!) The Stationers' Company, as we have seen, did not like outsiders' interfering in its rights and privileges. Okes had established copyright in a perfectly legal manner—and yet he had been deprived of it. The order from Court Book C tells us what happened six months later. Despite the protestations in the first edition that he was merely distributing the book privately, the Stationers' Company discovered that Daniel was selling copies in the retail market through a bookseller agent. John Crosley was a bookseller in Oxford.[36] (That his widow had not bought the books from the author but was only selling them on consignment is indicated: she was to get no compensation for the copies she turned over; Daniel was to be paid not only for his 160 but for her 40.) The Stationers' Company appears to have forced Daniel to cease selling his book in this way and to sell it 200 copies, 160 which he had (which may have been all that he had remaining in his possession) plus 40 copies which Widow Crosley had in her bookshop. Since the first edition had merely gone till the end of Stephen's reign, the Stationers' Company also saw to it that it would possess copyright in the augmented book. Then the Company put out an edition of its own in 1613, a copy of which the Pforzheimer Library possesses. When Daniel was ready to put out his completed history he had either to turn it over to the Stationers' Company or get a royal privilege. He did the latter, in 1618. I have already dealt with this edition above. Here is indicated, therefore, how stringently the Stationers' Company fought against an author who tried to evade their ordinance: that only stationers could engage in the selling of books and in the owning of copyright—the right to print and

[36] H. G. Aldis, and others, *A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland and Ireland . . . 1557-1640* (London, The Bibliographical Society, 1910), p. 82. His will was proved on February 12, 1613. He left the bulk of his estate, valued at more than five hundred pounds, to his wife. Like some widows of London stationers, she seems to have carried on his business.

publish. In the end, the author was forced to get royal copyright.

No. 272. (a) *STC* 6498. *The Double PP. . . . At London Imprinted.* 1606. "There are two issues, one was intended for general circulation, while the other, e.g. the present, was apparently for private distribution by the author. The titles of the two issues, except for the imprints, are from the same setting. The imprint of the general issue [the first] reads: 'London, Imprinted by T. C. and are to be sold by Iohn Hodgets, at his shop in Paules Church-yard, 1606.' The private issue [second] has an extra leaf, inserted following the title, which contains Dekker's dedicatory sonnet[37] to Sir Henry Cock . . . ." The Pforzheimer copy with the dedication to Cock is unique; the Bright-Bodleian copy has the shortened imprint. "This book was entered to Trundle and Edgar, 9th December 1605 [III:307], and although neither name appears in the published work, it is probable that they were the actual proprietors, Hodgets merely acting as agent." (b) It is quite probable that some special presentation copies were struck off for the author.[38] The *Pforzheimer Catalogue* in its further discussion of Trundle, Edgar, and Hodgets does not suggest that full stationer's copyright did not exist.

No. 292. (a) John Donne's *Biathanatos.* "Printed by John Dawson,". This—no date after the comma—is the whole imprint of the first issue of the first edition. "The unsold sheets of this edition were reissued with a cancel title, rubricated, imprint reading: 'London, printed for Humphrey Moseley, and are to be sold at his shop at the Princes Armes in St. Pauls Churchyard, 1648.' Most copies, according to Dr. Keynes, are of that second issue." "The publication was on the responsibility of Dr. John Donne [jr.] (Keynes lists seven copies with inscriptions by him) but from the imprint in the second issue it would appear that Seile, the bookseller who entered for the book [September 25, 1646; Eyre, *Transcript*, I:247] and who presumably managed the pub-

[37] Not a sonnet—seven couplets.

[38] See above, footnote 35.

lication for Donne, sold out to Moseley in 1648." (b) It is not clear what "on the responsibility of" and "managed the publication for" mean. It was probably the absence of Seile's name in the first issue imprint that lies behind the *Pforzheimer Catalogue* assumptions. I see no evidence for "private publication." Full ownership of copyright by stationers is indicated. Seile assigned the book to Moseley on June 13, 1649 (Eyre, *Transcript*, I: 320). Donne junior may have been supplied with presentation copies.

No. 362 A. (a) Sir Richard Fanshawe's translation, *Querer Por Solo Querer: To Love only for Love Sake . . . London, Printed by William Godbid, 1670.* "The unsold, or possibly the unpresented, copies were reissued with a cancel title which is printed on a cheaper grade of paper than the rest of the volume and reads as the present as far as the imprint: 'London, Printed by William Godbid, and are to be Sold by Moses Pitt, at the White-Hart in Little Britain. 1671.' " "It has been stated that all copies having the first issue title were presentation copies." (b) Presumably the reason for this assumption is the absence of a publisher's name in the first issue imprint. As we have seen, this imprint means that Godbid was the publisher as well as the printer. When the printer-publisher had another bookseller handle the book, the customary imprint (as in the second issue of the present book) was "Printed by A, and are to be sold by B."[39]

No. 391. Fuller's *Worthies of England*, the first edition, "Printed by J. G. W. L. and W. G. MDCLXII." On the fly-leaf of the Pforzheimer copy is written—the date is O. S.—"februarie 1661 given me by younge m^r^ fuller reward 5 £." "Copies of this book occur with a variant title in which Thomas Williams is given as the publisher. From the form of the imprint in the present copy, which is the one usually found, together with the fact that this book was not registered, it is not unlikely that it was printed at the charges of the author and of his son and that the latter, who saw

[39] Shaaber, *op. cit.*, p. 132.

the final portion through the press and wrote the dedication,[40] sold as many copies as possible by the method indicated in the inscription on the flyleaf of the present copy and that he disposed of the rest with the aid of Williams." (b) The absence of entrance in the Stationers' Register is no evidence for the assumption that the Fullers paid for the printing; nor is the issue without a publisher's name. The evidence, such as it is, shows that Williams was publisher and owner of the copyright: the issue with his name in the imprint was for sale in his own shop; the other issue was for sale in other booksellers' shops. Fuller's son was not "paid" for the copy he bestowed on the unknown recipient; he was "rewarded." I do not doubt that he was given a certain number of presentation copies.

No. 449 A. (a) *STC* 12863. *The Arch's of Triumph Erected in honor of the High and mighty prince, James, the first . . . Invented and published by Stephen Harrison Joyner and Architect: and graven by William Kip.* Colophon: *Imprinted at London by Iohn Windet, Printer to the Honourable Citie of London, and are to be sold at the Authors house in Lime-street, at the signe of thè Snayle. 1604.* This consists of an engraved title and seven plates. There is some text from Daniel's *Vision of the 12 goddesses* and Dekker's *Magnificent entertainment* and some new odes by Dekker and Webster. From the introductory matter we learn that Harrison, with a bounty from the city, paid for the printing. (b) This item corresponds to V and XIII in the Shaaber list. Sometimes stationers entered plates, but it is not clear whether print-making and print-selling came under the jurisdiction of the Stationers' Company. The subject deserves investigation.

No. 451. (a) *STC* 12902. Gabriel Harvey. *A New Letter of Notable Contents . . . London Printed by Iohn Wolfe* [*at the author's charge*], 1593. (The bracketed insertion is so in the *Pforzheimer*

[40] Which obviously in 1662 could not be to "James II," as the *Pforzheimer Catalogue* says it is. In the University of Michigan copy it is headed "To His Sacred Majesty"—Charles II, of course.

Catalogue.) "[Dr. McKerrow] has . . . constructed a plausible argument to the effect that Harvey was not responsible for the publication . . . . Indeed, he suggests that this was probably never intended by the author to be printed but to circulate in manuscript, if at all, and that Wolfe may have printed it against the author's wishes in order to recoup the cost of the *Supererogation*." (b) There is gross inconsistency here between the bracketed statement in the imprint and the note beneath. The work was entered by Wolfe on October 1, 1593 (II:636). I suspect that its customary misunderstanding of this typical printer-publisher imprint is at the bottom of the *Catalogue's* confusion.

No. 452. (a) *STC* 12903. *Pierces Supererogation . . . Gabriell Haruey. London Imprinted by Iohn Wolfe* [*at the author's charge*]. *1593*. (The bracketed insertion is so in the *Pforzheimer Catalogue*.) (b) No evidence is given for the assertion in brackets. There is no evidence in Harvey's preliminary letter that he paid for the publication. See my last sentence in (b) of No. 451.

No. 547. (a) *STC* 14772. [Ben Jonson.] *The Fortunate Isles and Their Vnion. celelebrated in a Masque design'd for the Court, on the Twelfth night. 1624* . . . . "The present edition may have been privately printed for the author for presentation, however see *Time Vindicated* [1623]." No. 556 (a) [Ben Jonson.] *Time Vindicated to Himselfe, And To His Honors. In the presentation at Court on Twelfth night. 1622* . . . . "In common with the separate editions of the Twelfth Night masques *Neptunes Triumph* [1624] and *The Fortunate Isles* [1625] the titles of which show a distinct uniformity, *Time Vindicated* has no imprint, the title ending in a rule followed by a quotation in italic type . . . ." "The absence of imprints, and the typographical uniformity of the titles in the case of the separate editions of the three masques cited may indicate that they were all privately printed for the author. *Time Vindicated* and *Neptunes Triumph* were first entered in the Stationers' Register 20th March 1640, apparently in preparation for the folio publication, not by transfer but by direct entry which

would seem to afford some support to such a theory. This would be a more tenable conclusion if copies were known with presentation inscriptions by Jonson similar to those" on copies of *Sejanus, Volpone, Masque of Queenes.* "Dr. Greg has shrewdly suggested that these particular masques were privately printed not for distribution by the author but for the use of the actors themselves." "This masque [*TV*] was intended to be given on Twelfth Night 1623, but was put off until 12th January. It was again postponed until the 19th when it was finally given at Whitehall in the Banqueting House. Since the date of performance on the title is 'Twelfth night,' as originally proposed, it is probable that this quarto was printed before that date and, therefore, probably for the use of the actors." (b) Greg's suggestion, which is supported by the unchanged date on the title-page of *Time Vindicated,* appears to me to be brilliant and correct.

No. 570. (a) *Pallantus and Eudora . . . Written by Mr. Henry Killigrew . . . London. Printed in the Year, 1653.* "Though the title in the present would seem to indicate that this edition was privately printed there is no other evidence to support such a theory. Moreover, some copies are known which have substituted for the imprint, given above, another reading: 'London. Printed for Iohn Hardesty at the Black-Spread-Eagle in Duck-lane, 1653.' The only indication of priority is that in the present state the 'D' in 'London' has worked loose and dropped so that it is the later of the two states." (b) Possibly, the first issue was for presentation purposes. Clearly Hardesty was the publisher and owner of the copyright. The *Pforzheimer Catalogue* quotes the publisher's derogatory remarks concerning an earlier unauthorized edition (*The Conspiracy,* 1638).

No. 974. (a) *STC* 23086. *Fowre Hymnes, Made by Edm. Spenser. London, Printed for William Ponsonby. 1596.* No. 975. (a) *STC* 23088. *Prothalamion Or A Spousall Verse made by Edm. Spenser . . . At London. Printed for William Ponsonby. 1596.* "Grosart conjectures that the present [*Prothalamion*] was privately printed be-

cause it was not entered in the Stationers' Register and there may be considerable weight to that argument if the *Fowre hymnes* 1596, is included for that also was printed for Ponsonby and without license; these two titles being the only ones, except the 1591 *Daphnaida* and possibly also *Colin Clout* 1595, of the eight Spenser titles printed for Ponsonby to be so distinguished. As a corollary to this proposition it should be observed that it is not at all unlikely that some copies of the present were originally sold by Ponsonby bound up with the *Fowre hymnes.*" (b) There is not a particle of evidence here that either book was "privately printed." In any given year in Shakespeare's time from a fifth to a third of the books published were not entered by the stationers who had them printed and owned copyright in them.—And we must be careful not to say that a book which was unentered was not "licensed," if by the last we mean the allowance of the ecclesiastic censors. Presumably, unless we have direct evidence to the contrary, we must assume that all books of any importance were first allowed by official authorities—whether or not they were entered in the Stationers' Register. (Even after 1586 the wardens continued to license ephemerae.) Robinson's *Eupolemia*, as McKerrow pointed out (*The Library* [London, 1930], 4th Series, XI:173-178), is our best evidence for these statements. But a more laborious method is to discover imprimaturs in books which were not registered at Stationers' Hall.

No. 986. (a) *Poems, By Thomas Stanley . . . Printed in the Year, 1651.* "The copies having the first title as in the present are believed to have been intended for presentation by the author to his friends. In 1652, the title was reset . . . ; the [new] imprint reads: 'London, Printed for Humphrey Moseley, and are to be sold at his Shop, at the Signe of the Princes Arms in S. Pauls Churchyard.. 1652.' " (b) The first issue may have been for presentation; but Moseley, apparently, owned the copyright.

No. 1016. (a) *STC* 24483. *Rime Di Petruccio Vbaldino . . .* [*London, by Richard Field*] *1596.* "This collection of Ubaldini's verse,

from both the imprint and contents as well as the author's frequent practice, was not printed for general sale but privately. In this copy there are manuscript corrections in a neat Italian hand which may well be that of Ubaldini himself . . . ." (b) Apparently to issue privately printed copies was Ubaldini's practice. See *STC* 24479, 24482, 24484, 24485, 24487—all of which were printed by Field but which like *STC* 24483 have only a date as an imprint. But it is to be noted that, just as in the case of Daniel's *History*, the Elizabethan printer seems to have considered himself as owner of the copyright even when the author paid for a private impression. *STC* 24479 = *Parte prima della breui dimonstrationi et precetti.* [R. Field], 1592. The imprint is exactly the same as that of the *Rime*. But Field entered the former on December 6, 1591 (II:599).

No. 1079. (a) *STC* 25899. *Britain's Remembrancer . . . by Geo: Wither . . . Imprinted for Great Britaine, and are to be sold by Iohn Grismond in Ivie-Lane.* MDCXXVIII. "On account of difficulties which had arisen with the Stationers' Company over the patent for his *Hymnes* of 1623, Wither was prevented from having this book registered in the usual way. Presumably, however, it was licensed by the ecclesiastical authorities for no trouble seems to have occurred in that respect, but it is rather doubtful if Wither actually set-up the type for this work himself as he claims in the note on verso fol. 14 for this is a Jeremiad of more than 20,000 lines and, as an apprentice compositor, it would probably have taken him much longer to set-up than it took him to write. Elsewhere, he states that four thousand copies were printed so that the printing was a task that must have engaged a whole printing office for some time. There is, however, little hope of identifying the printer—Grismond apparently merely acted as agent, Wither being the publisher." (b) I copy more of Wither's statement than the *Catalogue* does: "If you find any thing may seeme spoken out of due *Time*; blame not mee altogether; for, it is above two yeares since I laboured to get this *Booke* printed, and it

hath cost me more mony, more pains, and much more time to publish it, then to compose it: For, I was faine to imprint every sheet thereof with my owne hand, because I could not get allowance to doe it publikely: so unwilling are we of *Remembrancers* in this kind." I hesitate to make any affirmations, but doesn't Wither mean that he was *almost* driven to be his own compositor but that finally he did get authorization to have it printed and published? That he paid for the printing himself is possible. (We know that another Puritan pamphleteer, Prynne, sometimes paid for the printing of his work.)[41] But "mony" seems to refer rather to Wither's efforts to get the book published than to a printing bill. Grismond could have been the owner of the copyright and publisher: "sold by" sometimes meant "for" in imprints. " 'Sold by C.D.' rather than 'for C.D.,' in the last decade of the sixteenth century and the first two of the seventeenth, when most books of this group were published, had perhaps some charm of novelty and may have been occasionally preferred on that account."[42]

No. 1088. (a) [George Wither.] *Prosopopoeia Britannica . . . London, Printed by Robert Austin. 1648.* "Although this book was registered in the printer's name it is more than likely that it was actually published by Wither himself." (b) There is no evidence given for this assumption. Austin apparently owned the copyright.

No. 1092. (a) *Vox Pacifica . . . By Geo. Wither . . . London, Printed by Robert Austin, in the Old-Baily.* MDCXLV. "It is probable that in this instance, as well as in the others in which he was also associated, Austin acted merely as the printer; Wither managing the sale of his own books." (b) There is no evidence given for this assumption. Austin apparently owned the copyright. Both in regard to No. 1088 and No. 1092 I think the *Catalogue's* misinterpretation of a printer-publisher imprint has led to the assumption that the author published. I do not deny that Wither *may* have

[41] See E. W. Kirby, *William Prynne, A Study in Puritanism* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1931), p. 15.

[42] Shaaber, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

paid for the printing of Nos. 1088 and 1092 and sold them himself— but the *Pforzheimer Catalogue* presents no support for its hypothesis.

Under "Copyright" in the *Pforzheimer Catalogue* "Index of Bibliographica" is "property of author. 109." No. 109. (a) *Certain Miscellany Tracts. written by Thomas Brown, Kt. . . . Printed for Charles Mearne, and are to be sold by Henry Bonwick, at the Red Lyon, in St. Paul's Church-Yard, MDCLXXXIV.* "The preface is of some bibliographical interest on account of the request to possessors of transcripts of Browne's account of the monuments in the Cathedral of Norwich that 'without consent first obtained' they will forbear the publishing of it." (b) Here is no question of private copyright. According to the *Catalogue* it was the archbishop who edited the tracts. I assume that his authority lay behind the request.

Thus, though it supplies us rather liberally with information and conjectures concerning presentation copies, printing charges paid by the author or his representatives, engravings, special editions of masques struck off for actors, etc., the *Pforzheimer Catalogue* provides us with not one authentic case (outside of royal grant) of some one not in the Stationers' Company owning and controlling copyright—the right to print, publish, and sell books. Its material on Daniel's *History* reveals how strongly the guild fought such usurpation of its prerogatives. The examples I now cite confirm the conclusion that ownership of copyright by non-stationers was not only a rare but a financially dangerous business.

I begin with the publication of Hooker's *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity.*[43] Hooker could not find a stationer who was willing to risk publication. Sir Edwin Sandys agreed to pay him for the manuscript and undertake publication. Sandys made a contract with John Windet to print it. Windet, Bill, and other booksellers

[43] My material, except for references to the Stationers' Register, is drawn from C. J. Sisson, *The Judicious Marriage of Mr. Hooker* (Cambridge University Press, 1940), pp. 49-60, 66-78.

were to sell the book for Sandys, and Windet was to render the latter an account. Sandys, therefore, may be said to have owned the copyright. Windet entered the eight parts of the work on January 29, 1593 (II:625). Books I-IV were published in 1593, Book V in 1597, and Books I-V in 1604. The title-pages bore Windet's name in their imprints. Sisson holds that the decree of January, 1598 (noted above) against printing and selling for other than members of the Stationers' Company was a result of Windet's publication of Book V in December, 1597. Windet died in 1611, and Stansby became his successor. The former's copies were entered to Stansby on September 11, 1611 (III:466), and among them was Hooker's *Laws*. Stansby regarded the copy as solely his own and in 1611 reprinted in one volume the books that had appeared—although Sandys' copies had not all been sold. The guild apparently sustained Stansby's position. Sandys was unable to get redress. Stansby continued to print and sell the book (*STC* 13714-13720a). After his death, his widow transferred his copyright to Bishop in 1639 (IV:458); and the latter brought out new editions.

We need not go into all the details of the printing of John Dowland's *Second Booke of Songs Or Ayres* (1600),[44] but some are pertinent to our investigation of copyright owned by non-stationers. George Eastland, gentleman and musician, bought the MS from Dowland's wife. He then made an agreement with Thomas East, who printed music as the assign of Thomas Morley. Eastland was to pay the patent fee to Morley and Christopher Heybourn. East was to receive ten pounds for printing a thousand copies and extra payment for certain over-plus copies. The book was printed. It announced on its title-page that it was sold at Eastland's house. And Eastland also supplied booksellers with it. Eastland was therefore (as Miss Dowling recognizes) the ostensible publisher. Yet the book was entered to East alone on July

[44] Margaret Dowling, *The Printing of John Dowland's Second Booke of Songs or Ayres*, in: *The Library* (London, 1931-1932), 4th Series, XII:365-380.

15, 1600 (III:167). And that East and not Eastland did indeed own the copyright (outside the first edition) is indicated in a deposition by the latter. I quote Miss Dowling:

> East for his part promised not to print more than the thousand copies and the legitimate overplus books, 'soe longe,' says Eastland, 'as Yor said subiect his said bookes were to be had at Yor said subiect his handes.' This statement seems to imply that East acquired the copyright of the book by printing it, and that when Eastland had sold his thousand copies East would be at liberty to print further copies and to sell them to his own benefit. Such a custom is, of course, quite different from modern practice by which the publisher holds the copyright of a book unless he should choose to dispose of it. Possibly the Stationers' Company would not allow any one outside their number to register the book, which would account for the fact that it was entered under East's name. This would make the book the printer's property in the eyes of the Company and, so far as Eastland was concerned, he may have agreed that as a return to East for securing the registration, the copyright should pass to him after the first edition was sold.[45]

Quarles *appears* to have owned the copyright of the famous *Emblems*.[46] The book was entered by Marriot on May 2, 1634 (IV:318). The first edition was "sold at" his shop (*STC* 20540). On January 10, 1638 (IV:404) Marriot entered Quarles' *Hieroglyphics*. "This was obviously intended as a sixth book of the *Emblems*, for like the others it contains fifteen poems accompanied by engraved plates . . . . " In 1639 Quarles had the *Emblems* and *Hieroglyphics* printed together in one volume and sold two thousand copies, a large part of the edition, to Francis Eglesfield, a bookseller. The latter's name replaced that of Marriot on the engraved title-page. Then in February, 1640 Quarles wanted to borrow thirty pounds on a six months' loan for his son-in-law. He was able to get Eglesfield and another stationer, John Williams, to go bond for him. As security, Quarles gave a bill of sale for "the foresaid coppy booke or bookes & copper plates" to Williams and Eglesfield; if the son-in-law defaulted the copies and copperplates were to be forfeited. The son-in-law did not repay the loan,

[45] *Ibid.*, pp. 367-368.

[46] This paragraph is a digest of the material in G. S. Haight, *The Publication of Quarles' "Emblems,"* in: *The Library* (London, 1934-1935), 4th Series, XV:97-109.

and Williams and Eglesfield had to pay out thirty-three pounds. About six weeks later, shortly before Christmas, 1640, the two stationers began to print an edition of three thousand copies.[47] On October 13 (IV:523) Marriot had assigned the copyrights in *Emblems* and *Hieroglyphics* to Williams and Eglesfield, the bill of sale he signed apparently being the very one Quarles had given as security. Quarles began suit against the two. Eglesfield and Williams were willing to "redeliver the said coppie, plates, and bookes" to Quarles if he reimbursed them properly. Quarles eventually dropped the case. Thus, although Eglesfield's name appears in the 1639 imprint, Marriot was still the ostensible holder of the copyright. Yet the real owner was obviously Quarles, for he assigned the rights and copperplates to the two stationers. I think the true explanation of all this is that Quarles had the copperplates without which the books could not be printed. He really owned not the copyright but a set of engravings. It should be noted that according to the Stationers' Register, the copyright was possessed only by stationers: the books were entered by Marriot and assigned by him to Eglesfield and Williams.

We have found few examples of authors' controlling the publication of their work by royal grant. We have seen that there are very few examples of books which, according to their imprints, were printed for the author or sold by him. We have seen generally in the decree of January, 1598, and specifically in the cases of Daniel's *History* and Hooker's *Laws* that the stationers and their guild were prone to recognize no control over publishing and selling except by stationers. Nevertheless, the prevailing mode of an author's giving up all his rights for perpetuity when he sold his manuscript to a stationer was apparently beginning to undergo some change. Furthermore, the author began to assert his rights by making special contracts with his publisher. And these con-

[47] This must be *STC* 20541: "f. J. W[illiams]. a. F. E[glesfield]., 1635." This date can not be right for Eglesfield first took up his freedom in July, 1636 (Arber, *Transcript*, IV:30.)

tracts receive recognition in the registers. On March 11, 1607 (III:344) John Browne entered "a book called musicke of sundry Kyndes . . . Composed by Thomas fford." Beneath the entrance is an agreement of March 13 signed by Browne "that this copye shall neuer hereafter be printed agayne without the consent of master fford the Aucthour." The book came out the same year, "J. Windet, at the assignes of W. Barley, sold by J. Browne" (*STC* 11166). (Barley was the holder of the music patent at the time.) Whether or not the agreement meant that Ford was to receive further payment if Browne brought out a second edition, the agreement is extremely unusual in that it represents a limitation by the author of the stationers' hitherto unlimited rights to reprint. The fact that the book was printed under the music privilege renders the exact situation hazy. On December 8, 1627 (IV:191) William Jones entered John Dansie's *A mathematicall manuell.* Included in the entrance is "Memorandum that this booke is not to be reimprinted againe, without the consent of the author Master Dansye." The book came out the same year, "W. Jones for R. Cartwright" (*STC* 6267). Again, we can guess that the author wanted further remuneration if further editions came out. On September 22, 1628 (IV:202), William Jones entered Thomas Paybody's *A just apologie for kneeling in the act of receiving the lord's supper.* Beneath the entrance is a memorandum, signed by Jones, in which he promises "not to reimprinte the same booke againe with out the Authors Consent" and to "surrender vp the said Coppie to him againe, when he shall require it." The book came out the same year, for W. Jones (*STC* 19488). This contract meant not only that the stationer had his right to reprint limited but also that he had to surrender the copyright whenever the author chose. It is rather bewildering to see the guild acceding to such a drastic limitation of a member's traditional rights. There may have been special circumstances. By tradition, ordinance, and practice only stationers had anything to say about copyright.

The sudden interest in authors' rights by Parliament in the early 1640's was prompted, it appears, not so much by a belated ethical compulsion as by the necessity of protecting stationers' copyrights in a tumultuous period. In January, 1642, the Commons ordered that every publication bear the name of the author; the officers of the Stationers' Company were requested to take special Order "that the Printers do neither print or reprint anything without the Name and Consent of the Author."[48] In a declaration of 1643 signed by several prominent divines, it was stated that:

> considerable sums of money had been paid by stationers and printers to many authors for the 'copies' of such useful books as had been imprinted, in regard whereof we conceive it to be both just and necessary that they should enjoy a property for the sole imprinting of their copies; and we further declare that unless they do so enjoy a property, all scholars will be utterly deprived of any recompense from the stationers and printers for their studies or labour in writing and preparing books for the press; and that if books were imported to the prejudice of those who bore the charge of impressions, the authors and buyers would be abused by vicious impressions, to the great discouragement of learned men, and extreme danger of all kinds of good learning.[49]

What all this boils down to is that unless stationers' copyright were protected, it would be foolish for stationers to pay out money to authors for manuscripts that anyone might print or reprint whenever he wished. When Milton in his *Areopagitica* (1644) wrote: "the just retaining of each man his severall copy, which God forbid should be gainsaid,"[50] he was not thinking of the author but exclusively of the stationer.

Nevertheless, around the middle of the century we begin to find definite evidence of the emergence of a system much fairer to the author—the payment of royalties. Peter Heylyn sold the manuscript of his *Cosmography* in 1650 to the stationers, Seile and

[48] Commons Journals, January 29, 1642; quoted in W. M. Clyde, *Parliament and the Press, 1643-7*, in: *The Library* (London, 1932-1933), 4th Series, XIII: 400.

[49] Quoted in T. E. Scrutton, *The Law of Copyright* (London, 1903), pp. 19-20.

[50] *The Works of John Milton* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1931), IV: 353.

Chetwind. Apparently some agreement to continue remuneration to the author and his heirs was made, for his son, Henry Heylyn, sued Anne Seile (widow) and Chetwind because of a secret edition for which the Heylyns had received no payment.[51] A copy of the agreement between Milton and Samuel Simmons, the printer-publisher of *Paradise Lost*, has been preserved. It is dated April 27, 1667. Simmons entered the book in the Stationers' Register on August 20 (Eyre, *Transcript*, II:381). The agreement tells us that the poet sold the already licensed manuscript to the stationer for five pounds. When the first edition of 1300 was sold out, the poet was to get another five pounds. He was to be paid the same sum when the second edition was exhausted and the same sum when the third was exhausted. None of the editions was to exceed 1500 copies.[52] Milton's receipt, dated April 26, 1669, for the second five pounds paid him when the first impression had been completely sold is extant too.[53]

This paper is to be considered as a tentative survey of a rather unexplored territory. It is to be hoped that someone will carry the story beyond my narrow chronological limit.

[51] Harry Farr, *Philip Chetwind and the Allot Copyrights*, in: *The Library* (London, 1934-1935), 4th Series, XV:147, 152.

[52] David Masson, *The Life of John Milton* (London, Macmillan, 1880), VI: 509-511.

[53] Helen Darbishire, *The Printing of the First Edition of "Paradise Lost,"* in: *Review of English Studies* (London, 1941), XVII:415.

Book Reviews

SMITH, ROBERT METCALF and OTHERS. *The Shelley Legend.* [Rule] By Robert Metcalf Smith in collaboration with Martha Mary Schlegel, Theodore George Ehrsam and Louis Addison Waters. [Ornamental rule] [Shelley quotation] [Rule] New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1945. xii, 343 pp. Frontispiece, Facsimiles, 9½ x 6⅜ inches. $5.00.

Professor Smith has indicated generally the contribution of each assistant, but except for sections by Mr. Waters, the handwriting expert, I cannot identify the author of any given passage. I shall therefore usually refer to Professor Smith as the author.

The book demands rather close knowledge of Shelley's life and some acquaintance with previous studies. With one or two lapses by Mr. Waters, who sometimes talks down to the reader, this point of view is preserved.

The author's thesis is that, after Shelley's death, Mary returned to England, embraced conservative social views, and invented the legend that Shelley was nearly flawless; that she suppressed damaging facts, bought and encouraged the buying of forged letters, and taught her daughter-in-law, Lady Shelley, to do likewise; that Lady Shelley passed on the legend to the present day by refusing scholars the direct use of documents, by giving false data to Dowden, the official biographer, and by giving manuscripts she knew to be forged to Sir John Shelley-Rolls and the Bodleian. With this thesis I have no fundamental quarrel. The motive was originally to reëstablish the respectability of the family and to smooth a path for Shelley's son. But the original simplicity of motive became complex, and the authors appear too hard on the family, who were not scheming worldlings, as the reader may infer. A more temperate view is suggested at one point (p. 257):

"During the twenty-five years when they had quarrelled with, taken exception to, or protested against every friend of Shelley's who had ventured to record the Shelley he had known, Sir Percy and Lady Shelley had come to cherish very definite opinions about Shelley, by no means based upon fact, but which, because they wished to believe them, had become fact to them."

On the other hand, the treatment of T. J. Wise and his friends, who also helped spread the legend and the forgeries, seems far too lenient and unsuspicious. For example, Professor Smith says (p. 87) in reference to Wise's statement that his copy of the December 15-16 letter "is absolutely genuine beyond any possible doubt": "Had Wise been aware that both Sir Percy and Lady Shelley at different times had themselves declared it a forgery, he would have written differently." I think not. Wise's frauds were undiscovered, and he had a low opinion of his opponents; under no imaginable circumstances would he have admitted any doubt of such an important manuscript in his own collection.

The Major Byron forgeries form the crux of the book. The treatment of this rascal's career and the study of the twenty-five letters known to be forgeries soon after their publication in 1852, and of their writer's approach to Mary through Hookham, are first-rate. The problem is complicated in that the forger often used authentic materials, usually printed. Furthermore, the imitation of Shelley's hand is skillful. I cannot see that Mary knew that the letters she bought were forgeries; they were not so identified till after her death. She bought "copies" of poems; perhaps she should have suspected that she might also be buying "copies" of letters, but no evidence has been adduced to that effect. Lady Shelley's case is different: she possessed duplicates of letters in the same hand, and made no effort to explain this phenomenon. Both sets now appear to be forgeries.

Professor Smith is to be congratulated on finding and reproducing three specimens of Major Byron's own letters, and in giving eleven specimens of Shelley's hand and one of Mary's. The proof of forgery is necessarily elaborate, but convincing. The crucial letter is that of December 15-16, 1816, to Mary at Bath, in which occurs the much debated statement that Harriet had "descended the steps of prostitution" and that Eliza was responsible for the "murder." Professor Smith shows that there are four variant "originals" of the letter and that no genuine original has ever been produced. Two of the four are reproduced, both Major Byron forgeries. There is no reason to believe that Shelley wrote this letter. Provenance of existing manuscripts supports this. The argument on handwriting may be summed up thus: the slant of the forgeries is much less acute than Shelley's; the capital "B's," "P's" and "S's" show significant variation from Shelley's, as do the "t's," "g's" and "y's," the last two especially in the frequency in which long tails are used medially in words. In all these differences, the resemblances with the forger's known hand are visible. A striking single bit of proof is in the letters "Lon" in "London," where the

"n" is higher than the "o" in the forger's hand and lower in Shelley's.

Mr. Waters is once both contradictory and inaccurate. Speaking of the curved tails of "y's" and "g's," he says that "almost all of them are confined to final letters" in Shelley's hand (p. 45). On page 101 occurs a similar statement. But on page 108: "Shelley did not use this form [of "y"] at the beginning or in the interior of a word; his curved tail "y" was strictly a terminal letter." But such a "y" is reproduced in the letter to Godwin of July 17, 1816, "you," page 2, l. 6. It is also unfortunate that Mr. Waters refers to points in letters not reproduced here, though the same points could be illustrated by these cuts. Moreover, reference is difficult because the cuts are unpaged.

A final word about some of the flaws of the book. Footnotes are poorly handled: with a few exceptions, the author's last name is given first, a practice unjustified except in alphabetical lists. This is the worst: "Dowden, Edward, Garnett, Richard, and Rossetti, William Michael, *Letters about Shelley*" (p. 176). Although there is no short-title list, short titles are frequently used for the first few references to a work, and much later a full title appears. Ellipsis is uselessly indicated in notes: "*After Shelley* . . . edited . . . by Sylvia Norman" (p. 141). The proof-reading is imperfect: "Hoggs" on page 173; "*In*" as part of a title on page 139; "alleged Shelley letter" repeated on page 339. The last two lines on page 167 and the first on page 168 make no sense: apparently two lines or more have dropped out. There is some haggling about trifles: Paston and Quennell are accused of misstating Claire's age at death as eighty, whereas Professor Smith insists (p. 215) that she died "in her eighty-first year," which is the same thing. On this same repetitious page, Fanny, Mary, Claire, and Trelawny are said to have died "aged" twenty-two, fifty-four, eighty-one, and eighty-nine respectively; two are correct and two wrong according to Professor Smith's own figures.

The book's most serious fault is its ill-humor. Thus we find Professor White "following the primrose path" (p. 306), and "protective, apologetic, and sentimental" (p. 261). Professor Jones is pilloried on pages 25, 67, and 71.

With faults and virtues in an unhappy mixture, the book is nevertheless a guidepost to Shelleyan scholarship. The warning to cleave to manuscripts and study them, and to avoid the influence of family and of official biography is one which all scholars may profitably heed.

E. L. McAdam, Jr.

Jonathan Dickinson's Journal or, God's Protecting Providence. Being a Narrative of a Journey from Port Royal in Jamaica to Philadelphia between August 23, 1696 and April 1, 1697. Edited by Evangeline Walker Andrews and Charles McLean Andrews, Farnum Professor of American History in Yale University, Emeritus. New Haven, Connecticut: printed for the Yale University Press . . . MD CCCC XLV (Yale Historical Publications. Manuscripts and Edited Texts XIX). x, 252 pp. 26 illus. and facsimiles and 7 pp. route maps. Price $3.00.

Here is a well-documented, scholarly edition reprinted for bibliophiles and libraries, of the exceedingly rare original edition that Reinier Jansen of Philadelphia printed in 1699, of which no more than six copies can now be traced to their location in the Friends Reference Library of London; New York Public Library; Henry E. Huntington Library; Newberry Library; Library Company of Philadelphia; an imperfect copy at Harvard College Library; and two or maybe three copies besides, which were at one time noted, but cannot now be found. Concerning all of these the editors give provenance and other bibliographical data beyond what has hitherto been known.

In an "Introduction" of twenty-two pages Mrs. Andrews recites the story of the Dickinson narrative, and the joint editing of this reprint by her and her "incomparable companion and collaborator," her distinguished husband, in this "the last" of their "many voyagings together," in their explorations—he as captain and she as mate, of "the enchanted realm of American Colonial History."

It was on September 23, 1696, that the barkentine *Reformation*, on her way from the island of Jamaica to Philadelphia, was wrecked off Jupiter Island, Florida, about twenty miles to the north of the present West Palm Beach, where the editors of this work spent seven winters together, and so became interested in Dickinson's work, and undertook this edition at the suggestion of a friend and Florida bibliophile, Louis Capron of West Palm Beach.

Aboard the *Reformation* were twenty-five persons, among them Jonathan Dickinson, a Quaker merchant of Jamaica, accompanied by his wife and a six-months' old son, and Robert Barrow, an elderly Quaker missionary. Besides the peril of shipwreck, the party on securing *terra firma* were made captive by the primitive Florida cannibalistic coastal Indians, who stripped them of clothes and other possessions. The party so deprived and half-starved managed, nonetheless, to proceed more on foot, less in

canoes or small boats, through the dangerous waterways and swamps, passing through hostile Indian towns, a distance up the coast of two hundred miles to St. Augustine, where they were befriended by the Spaniards, who aided them to reach Charleston, South Carolina, in the winter of 1696.

Dickinson, who was but thirty-three years old when he made this voyage, was a son of a planter and storekeeper of Jamaica, and a Quaker. Notwithstanding his dire experiences on this recorded voyage, he made frequent trading trips between Philadelphia and Jamaica from 1699 to 1708, in which latter year he was taken captive by the French, but was released. He became a wealthy landowner and trader of Philadelphia; at one time he owned thirty-two negroes. He held various public offices, including that of mayor of Philadelphia from 1717 to 1719, and in 1718 was speaker of the provincial assembly; at the time of his death in 1722, aged fifty-nine years, he was a justice of the peace.

The editors of this reprint have added much new information in two appendices that take up more than half of the volume, concerning the persons involved, the geographical aspects of the voyage, and particularly a chapter on *The Florida Indians in the Seventeenth Century,* that is an illuminating study. Pages 163-233 are of real bibliographical interest, revealing thorough research. Here are reproduced the title-pages of nineteen editions, issues, and translations of Dickinson from 1700 to 1868. The reprints include two states of 1700 and two of 1868, and all reprints are considered textually and otherwise critically; while copies are located in libraries. There is on pages 196-204 a biographical sketch of Reinier Jansen the printer. On pages 209-228 *The Quakers and Their Printers in London* are recounted.

The Andrews reprint follows the original text of 1699, "modernizing only the bewildering spelling, use of capital letters, and occasional punctuation, in order to make easier the reading." Besides commending itself to bibliophiles and libraries, this edition makes an independent contribution to Quaker history; and in the words of the editors the Dickinson narrative "has become a valuable part of the colonial history of both England and America." There is a satisfactory index (pages 243-252).

Victor Hugo Paltsits

YOUNG, PATRICK, 1584-1652, Compiler. *Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Wigorniensis:* Made in 1622-1623 by Patrick Young Librarian to King James I. [rule] Edited with an Introduction by Ivor Atkins, Librarian of Worcester Cathedral and Neil A. Ker, Lecturer in Palaeography in the University of Oxford. [rule] [device of Cambridge University] Cambridge: At the University Press, 1944. [New York: The Macmillan Company] Title-page enclosed in double rule. 84 pp. 10½ x 7¼ inches. $4.00.

During the Second World War, with its explosions and fires that devastated the buildings of Monte Cassino and countless other ancient libraries and archives, there came in much-bombed England not the destruction but the discovery of the earliest known comprehensive catalogue of the manuscripts of the cathedral of Worcester. The catalogue had been compiled in 1622-1623 by the librarian to King James I, Patrick Young, sonorously Latinized as Patricius Junius. In July 1622 Young had been granted a credit of £100 "or more if needful" . . . "to make search in all cathedrals for old manuscripts and ancient records, and to bring an inventory of them to His Majesty" (Atkins and Ker, p. 2). The inventories of at least five cathedral libraries (Lichfield, St. Paul's London, Salisbury, Winchester and Worcester) came later into the hands of the celebrated jurist, John Selden (d. 1654). In 1941 they were in the possession of Mr. James Fairhurst of Oldham, Lancashire, who allowed each of the five cathedral chapters named to acquire Young's inventory of its own codices.

The task of editing his part of the find was assumed by the present librarian at Worcester, Sir Ivor Algernon Atkins, since 1897 organist and master of the choristers of the cathedral, a composer and editor of musical compositions. As co-editor he chose Neil R. Ker of the University of Oxford, one of England's most distinguished palaeographers. The volume was published not far from Sir Ivor's seventy-fifth birthday.

The handsomely printed book gives the text of Young's catalogue, with valuable annotations. It tabulates the divergent call numbers assigned to the manuscripts by successive librarians, traces when possible the whereabouts of manuscripts now in other libraries, and records the titles of codices formerly reported at Worcester which have since disappeared without leaving a trace. A brief but carefully made index guides students safely through endless details.

No comprehensive mediaeval catalogue of the Worcester manuscripts can be found today. The earliest printed list, published at Oxford in 1697

as part of [Edward Bernard's] *Catalogi MSS. Angliae et Hiberniae* and reprinted at Worcester in 1860 (p. 28), was prepared by a canon named William Hopkins (1647-1700). It is a revision of a handwritten inventory contained in Bodleian MS. Tanner 268, dating from the second half of the seventeenth century. This was based mainly on mediaeval labels pasted on the covers of the codices themselves, and did not present the results of fresh analyses of each codex (p. 27; p. 69). Therefore the discovery in 1941 of Patrick Young's own catalogue of 1622-1623 was doubly welcome; it gave data amassed a generation earlier than Hopkins's by an expert considered in those days to be first rate.

Of human interest is the story of the scholars who have utilized and sometimes have caused the permanent removal of Worcester manuscripts. Thus John Leland, the king's antiquary under Henry VIII, took away ten handsome folios on theology or law; they still exist in London, Oxford or Cambridge. Queen Elizabeth's Archbishop Parker, often considered the founder of the Society of Antiquaries, received from Worcester eleven codices, four of which were in Anglo-Saxon, the study of which he fostered. All eleven are now in Cambridge. Soon after Patrick Young reported on his visits to Worcester, King James I sent a request "for all such dubble manuscripts as we have dubble in our liberary"; and twenty codices were duly dispatched to London in 1625 to strengthen the collection at Westminster Abbey, where new housing for books was under construction (p. 4). There is no trace of their reaching that destination. If an American reviewer may hazard a guess, it is that copies of works as common as ninety per cent of the duplicates were, may well have been diverted by some authority to a poorer institution. They may, however, have been destroyed in the fire of 1695.

To mention but two more diverters of codices, Sir William Dugdale, author of *The Antiquities of Warwickshire* (1656) and chief compiler of the monumental *Monasticon Anglicanum,* used much material at Worcester; and his patron Christopher, first Baron Hatton, acquired more than a dozen Worcester manuscripts, now in the Bodleian (p. 14; p. 82).

Students of the history of the text of the Latin Vulgate will be interested in an excursus, "The 'Offa' Bible and the Nero-Middleton Cartulary" (pp. 77-79). The celebrated Codex Amiatinus, written at the command of Ceolfrid, abbot of Jarrow and Monkwearmouth (d. 716), was designed as a present to the Pope; but two sister manuscript Bibles, less stately in form but doubtless agreeing in text, were made simultaneously with

Amiatinus. Eleven leaves of one of them are now in the British Museum (Add. MSS. 45025 and 37777). Sir Ivor Atkins suggested in 1940 that St. Wulfstan, bishop of Worcester (c. 1055-1095) caused a copy of Worcester charters to be written "*in bibliotheca sancte ecclesie*" which is translated on p. 78 as "in the Bible of the Church." Although the word *bibliotheca* means "library" rather than "Bible," Sir Ivor's theory is supported by the fact that both the Bible leaves and the leaves of the cartulary have forty-four lines to a page; and their dimensions, which are unusual, agree almost perfectly.

The present learned volume will make it easier to prepare some day a revision and augmentation of the only recent comprehensive list of the Worcester codices. This was printed for the Worcestershire Historical Society in 1906: *Catalogue of Manuscripts Preserved in the Chapter Library of Worcester Cathedral. Compiled by the Rev. John Kestell Floyer . . . and Edited and Revised by Sidney Graves Hamilton* . . . ([xviii], 196 p. 9¾ in.). Their descriptions omit measurements, and in a number of cases, pagination or foliation. The best work was that done on the liturgical items by the distinguished Walter Howard Frere, subsequently bishop of Truro. Although efforts were made to complete name and title entries for the manuscripts in the field of mediaeval canon law and moral theology, the neglect of these studies by nearly all English scholars since the Reformation has made the descriptions of such items quite inadequate. All that is necessary is to re-examine those items with the aid of work by Roman Catholic scholars on the continent of Europe, much of which can be found in or through the French theological encyclopedias as listed by I. G. Mudge in the sixth edition of her *Guide to Reference Books* (Chicago, American Library Association, 1936), through monographs like Kuttner's *Repertorium der Kanonistik* (1937; see Atkins and Ker, p. 66) and in Bishop Michael Buchberger's ten-volume *Lexikon für Theologie and Kirche* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1930-1938).

WILLIAM WALKER ROCKWELL

HOBSON, G. D. *Blind-Stamped Panels in the English Book-Trade, c. 1485-1555*, by G. D. Hobson. London, The Bibliographical Society, 1944. 111 pp. Illus. 8 plates. 8¾ x 7 inches. (Supplement to the Bibliographical Society's *Transactions*, No. 17.)

A great deal of work has been done in recent years on Continental blind-stamped panels. Little has been published on English panels since the

work of E. G. Duff on the early English booktrade and the studies of W. H. J. Weale on the collections in the British Museum and the National Art Library, South Kensington. This monograph by Geoffrey Dudley Hobson is the first separate important study of their early use in the English booktrade.

The panel is significant in that its reproduction required a blocking press and enabled the binder or stationer to have decorative covers repeated mechanically on simple leather bindings. Thus its introduction led to a distinction between hand work and machine work which runs through all the later history of the craft. Probably the first of these panels was brought to England by William of Mechlen, a printer from the Netherlands, about 1485. With the Act of 1534 suppressing alien workers, the use of the panel in England gradually died out and did not reappear until the end of the century.

The years covered have been divided into three periods: 1485-1509, the beginning; 1510-1535, the flourishing; and 1535-1555, the decadent period. In each period stationers or binders, subjects, motifs and types of designs are discussed and outlined in detail, while appendices further describe specific panel bindings, stationers or tools. Appendix V tabulates the known reproductions of panels under stationers' names, under subjects and type of ornament. Names of binders, booksellers and printers, initials and monograms are fully indexed, as well as the Weale rubbings of panel bindings.

Altogether Mr. Hobson identifies nearly two hundred blind-stamped panels which were in use in England. Just where they were engraved is another problem. He feels that the more the subject is studied, the less likely it will seem that the best of these decorative panel-stamps used in the English booktrade were of English workmanship, although some may have been designed and engraved by foreigners in England. Mr. Hobson acknowledges a debt to Mr. J. B. Oldham, who turned over to him his descriptions of panels from his research in the Shrewsbury School Library. Mr. Hobson also searched thoroughly through catalogues and monographs on bookbinding to locate specimens which he was not able to examine personally. From his years of experience in the booktrade he has been able, despite wartime restrictions on accessibility, to present a comprehensive picture of the early use of blind-stamped panel bindings in England.

The most important panels were those of Royal Arms and Emblems. The pictorial panels he classifies under subjects such as The Shepherds,

The Baptism of Christ, or St. Bernard. He further shows how the treatment of these subjects in English panels differs from that of those on the Continent, notably in The Adoration of the Magi, and The Flagellation. The signed panels raise a problem not only in identification, but also with regard to who used them. Most of those which can be identified are the marks of stationers, although some are the signatures of bookbinders.

Mr. Hobson makes it evident that a number of important problems are still to be solved in this hitherto rather neglected field. The care with which he has documented the source of his information and the location of the bindings described, makes it possible for other scholars to compare their findings and proceed from this point.

It is unfortunate that this publication is available only to members of the English society.

CHARLES MARSHALL ADAMS

AUTHORS OF THE PAPERS IN THIS ISSUE

DR. CARL J. WEBER, a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford University 1914-1917, is Roberts Professor of English Literature at Colby College, Waterville, Maine. He is a collector of Hardyana.

PROFESSOR JOHN ROBERT MOORE teaches English at Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana. From July to December 1945 he had leave-of-absence which he spent in England teaching at the Shrivenham American University.

DR. CURT F. BÜHLER is the Curator of Early Printed Books at The Pierpont Morgan Library, New York City, and is a frequent contributor to the PAPERS.

DR. LEO KIRSCHBAUM is a member of the English Department of St. Louis University. The Johns Hopkins Press published his *The True Text of King Lear* in 1945. The present paper is an excerpt from his forthcoming *Shakespeare and the Stationers*.